



FIDELITY BONDS

for

ADMINISTRATORS IN
PROBATE

RECEIVERS AND COM-
MITTEES IN LUNACY

RECEIVERS AND
MANAGERS IN CHAN-
CERY

TRUSTEES AND
SPECIAL MANAGERS
IN BANKRUPTCY . .

TRUSTEES UNDER
DEEDS OF ARRANGE-
MENT

and for

ALL GOVERNMENT AND COMMERCIAL APPOINTMENTS

. in which security is required

Legal & General Assurance Socy. Ltd.

10, Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4.

Established 1836.

Assets £13,000,000.

The Society transacts all the
principal classes of Insurance,
except Marine.

The Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.

(ESTABLISHED IN 1857.)

LONDON, AUGUST 7, 1920.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE:

£2 12s. ; by Post, £2 14s. ; Foreign, £2 16s.

HALF-YEARLY AND QUARTERLY SUBSCRIPTIONS IN PROPORTION.

*. The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

GENERAL HEADINGS.

CURRENT TOPICS	693	PRIZE COURT WORK IN THE LONG	
MORTGAGE INTEREST UNDER THE RENT		VACATION	703
RESTRICTION ACT, 1920	695	THE BUSINESS OF THE KING'S BENCH	
THE STATUTORY TENANCY UNDER THE		DIVISION DURING THE VACATION	703
RENT RESTRICTION ACT	696	LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	704
CORRESPONDENCE	697	LEGAL NEWS	704
BOOK OF THE WEEK	697	WINDING-UP NOTICES	704
NEW ORDERS, &c.	700	CREDITORS' NOTICES	705
SOCIETIES	702	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	707

Cases Reported this Week.

Ellis' Settlement, Re. Washbrough v. Boyce	700
Fisher, Reeves & Co. v. Armour & Co.	698
Kelantan Coconut Estates (Limited and Reduced), Re	700
Meadows v. Ellerman Lines (Lim.)	698
Nicholson v. Jackson	699
Reckitt v. Cody	699

Current Topics.

The New Solicitors' Remuneration Order.

WE PRINT elsewhere an Order which has been made under the Solicitors' Remuneration Act, 1881, providing that the remuneration of a solicitor in respect of all business regulated by clause 2 (c) of the General Remuneration Order—i.e., conveyancing matters not covered by the scale fees and other non-contentious matters—may, at the option of the solicitor, be by a gross sum in lieu of by detailed charges; but this is subject to a proviso that, within twelve months after delivery of a gross sum charge, the client may require a detailed bill to be delivered, and such bill will be subject to taxation in the usual way. This, we presume, is the outcome of the negotiations between the Council of the Law Society and the Lord Chancellor with respect to gross sum charges which are referred to in the Report of the Council recently issued (see *ante*, p. 620), and we may remind our readers of the efforts of the Liverpool Law Society in this direction (62 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, pp. 117, 129), and no doubt other law societies have contributed. The sub-committee of the Liverpool Law Society made suggestions as to the appropriate gross sum charges for settlements, articles of partnership and other matters, and no doubt these or other similar suggestions will be available for general use. But the actual arranging of charges under the new Order in particular cases will naturally depend on the trouble involved in the work and the pecuniary value of the interests concerned.

The Remuneration of Law Clerks.

WE PRINT elsewhere a resolution of the Joint Conciliation Board of the Law Society and London Law Clerks' recommending that, pending the full consideration of the clerks' claim for increased remuneration, an immediate all-round adequate increase on pre-war salaries is desirable in cases where such adequate increases of salary have not already been made. Some six months ago (*ante*, p. 290) the Council of the Law Society intimated that pre-war wages were insufficient, and, if we may judge from the useful discussion at the annual meeting of the Berks, Bucks and Oxfordshire Incorporated Law Society, of which a report was supplied to us recently (*ante*, p. 618), the matter has received the careful attention of the Provincial Law Societies. The same report shows some of the difficulties incident to it, such, for example, as the grading

of clerks. With all expenses of living gone up, and little enough chance of their coming down in a hurry, the necessity of increased wages is apparent, and it may be hoped that the full consideration of the subject which is pending will lead to a satisfactory result. The relations between a solicitor and his clerks are often of such confidence and intimacy that the essential pecuniary aspect should receive as liberal treatment as is reasonably possible, and we believe this is the general desire. We notice that the resolution speaks of "salaries." We have followed the example of A. L. SMITH, M.R., who referred once in the Court of Appeal to the hard work the judges did for their "wages."

Vacation Business.

THE Lord Chief Justice, in a statement made on the 30th ult., which we reprint elsewhere from the *Times*, announced the arrangements made for the business of the King's Bench Division during the vacation. The object, he said, was to make provision for the hearing of any urgent case, with the exception that no case would be heard with a jury on account of the difficulty of summoning juries during the vacation. The rules with regard to vacation business are contained in R.S.C., ord. 63, and under rule 4 (2) any party to a matter in the King's Bench Division can apply, after 26th July and before the close of the vacation, for the trial of the matter during the vacation, but the judge must be satisfied that there is urgent need for the hearing during the vacation. And, similarly in the Chancery Division, no case can be taken unless it requires to be "immediately or promptly heard" (r. 11). No doubt it is convenient for everyone that there should be a break in court business at the end of July, and there is no objection to scrutinizing somewhat carefully the matters which claim to be heard. But the practice in this respect—and the wording of the rules on which it is founded—is too rigid, and the inordinate length of the vacation is hardly likely to survive unless the judges shew a greater disposition to proceed with matters which the parties desire to be heard, whether in the opinion of the Bench they are pressing or not. A little more encouragement to vacation business might be the means of saving the vacation.

The Law of Property Bill and Compulsory Registration of Title.

THE LETTER from Mr. J. ROWLAND HOPWOOD, which we print elsewhere, emphasizes the suggestion we made last week that the postponement of Part I. of the Law of Property Bill should be accompanied by a postponement of any attempt to extend compulsory registration. Clause 170 of the original Bill (177 in the amended Bill) has been adversely reported upon by the Land Transfer Committee of the Council of the Law Society, and presumably representations were made to the Lord Chancellor accordingly. But evidently these were unavailing. When the Bill was introduced we expressed the opinion that it would be of little use to attempt to alter the clause, but we suggested that no further compulsory order should be made till there has been time to test the proposed new system of conveyancing (*ante*, p. 318). The postponement of Part I. makes it important that this postponement also of the extension of compulsion should be secured.

Mr. Benn's Memorandum on the Bill.

WE HAVE called attention more than once to the absence so far of any comments other than those in the legal press on the merits of Part I. of the Bill. We are glad, therefore, to have received a copy of a Memorandum by Mr. EDWARD H. BENN, one of the Conveyancing Counsel to the Court, in which the scheme for confining legal estates to the fee simple and a term of years, and of classifying all other interests as equitable interests, and placing them "behind a veil," where they shall be safe from inquisitorial purchasers, is criticized. To a considerable extent the criticism agrees with the comments of the scheme we have ourselves frequently made. These provisions—"curtain provisions" Mr. BENN calls them—do not seem to make for the simplicity of the law relating to the

beneficial interests in property. We hope to state Mr. BENN's views more at length hereafter. There is no doubt as to the general object of the Bill. It is to make the legal estate do the duty of a register of title. This point was very clearly made by Mr. J. E. HOGG in the course of the interesting articles which he contributed to our volumes recently on "Property Law Reform at Home and Overseas" (*ante*, p. 443). The ultimate aim of Part I. of the Bill on this view is to reduce every conveyance of land, so far as purchasers are concerned, to the same simple form as an entry in the proprietorship register. Similarly Mr. BENN says that the "curtain provisions"—which are not an essential part of the scheme for the assimilation of real to personal estate—constitute "an attempt to place that notional entity, the legal estate, into the same position as regards making title to land as the statutory estate of a registered proprietor under the Land Transfer Acts"; but, he adds, "without the safeguards of the controlling hand of the Chief Registrar and his assistants, the system of cautions, and the Insurance Fund which exist under those Acts." The development of this criticism and its relation to the various schemes for the reform of conveyancing, beginning with Messrs. WOLSTENHOLME and CHERRY's Bill of 1896, and resulting in Part I. of the present Bill, we must, as we have said, keep for subsequent comment.

The Use of Patented Inventions by Government Departments.

PRIOR to the Act of 1883 a patent did not bind the Crown, and any Government Department could use the patented invention as if the patent did not exist. This was changed by the Act of 1883, which enacted, by section 27, that a patent should bind the Crown, but the officers or authorities administering any department of the service of the Crown might use the invention for the services of the Crown on the terms indicated by the section. If the invention was so used the practice then was for the patentee to proceed by petition of right. The Patents and Designs Act, 1907, dealt with the matter by section 29, which was as follows:—"A patent shall have to all intents the like effect as against His Majesty the King as it has against a subject: provided that any Government department may, by themselves, their agents, contractors, or others, at any time after the application use the invention for the services of the Crown on such terms as may, either before or after the use thereof, be agreed on with the approval of the Treasury between the department and the patentee, or in default of agreement, as may be settled by the Treasury after hearing all parties interested." By the Patents and Designs Act, 1919, there is substituted for this a new section 29, which repeats the earlier part of the above quoted section, but substitutes a new and more elaborate proviso, the only part of which it is necessary, for present purposes, to quote running: "In case of any dispute as to the making, use or exercise of an invention under this section, or the terms therefor . . . the matter shall be referred to the Court for decision . . . The Court . . . may, with the consent of the parties, take into consideration the validity of the patent for the purposes only of the reference, and for the determination of the issues between the applicant and such Government department." The section came into operation on 23rd April of this year.

The Tribunal to Settle Disputes.

THE PROVISIONS quoted above came into question in the case of *Hale's Patent*, before SARGANT, J., on the 22nd of July. FREDERICK MARTIN HALE was the owner of certain patents relating to the manufacture of grenades and aircraft bombs. The patented inventions were used by the Government, and a year or two ago the patentee presented a petition to the Treasury, asking that the terms on which the Government should be deemed to have used the inventions should be ascertained. The Treasury refused to admit either the validity of the patents or that they had been infringed, and rejected the petition. The patentee then moved before SARGANT, J., that the Court should decide under the new section 29 the dispute between him and the Treasury. The motion was refused, but leave to appeal was given. The learned Judge held that "the

Court" in section 29 is the High Court, and not the special judge appointed by the Lord Chancellor under section 92 (2) of the Act of 1907. He then considered the question whether the new section 29 was retrospective in the sense that it changes the tribunal in regard to the user of patented inventions prior to the date when it came into operation, or only in the case of user after that time. He held that the section was not retrospective in the above sense; that the Court is the tribunal to deal with the user of patented inventions by the Crown as from 23rd April, 1920; and that the old tribunal (the Treasury) is left to deal with claims in respect of user prior to that date. As the learned Judge pointed out, the result of his decision is that the patentee cannot have the compensation (if any) due to him for the use of his invention by the Crown determined, unless and until he has established the validity of his patent, and the infringement thereof in an ordinary patent action. This was the course which was adopted after the Act of 1883 came into operation: see *Nobel's Explosives Co. v. Anderson* (11 R. P. C. 115 and 519).

Diversity of Marriage Law Within the Empire.

THE LATEST illustration of the diversity of the law of marriage in the British Empire is the case of *Higham v. Higham* (*Times*, 28th July). Possibly it may have puzzled some lawyers, as it certainly must have puzzled many laymen, to understand exactly why the petitioner was entitled to a decree of nullity here after contracting a marriage in Australia which was valid there. The newspaper report requires to be slightly supplemented to make it quite intelligible. The parties were nephew and aunt. The petitioner, at the age of twenty, went out to Australia expressly for the purpose of marrying the respondent, who was then forty-two years of age and the widow of petitioner's uncle. They were married in the State of Victoria, and by the law of Victoria (which, however, is not the same in all States of the Commonwealth) the marriage was valid until declared null by a competent tribunal. It is true proceedings might have been taken in Victoria as well as in England to have the marriage declared null, but until so declared it was valid by local law. The ground for avoiding the marriage in both jurisdictions is the same, viz., that it is within the prohibited degrees of affinity. The difference between the law of England and that of Victoria is that by the Marriage Act, 1835 (5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 54), often called Lord LYNDBURST'S Act, which came into force on 31st August, 1835, these marriages between persons within the prohibited degrees were made void; prior to 31st August, 1835, they were merely voidable, and could only be declared void by sentence of an ecclesiastical court pronounced during the lifetime of both the parties. This Act did not operate in Victoria, where only English statutes enacted prior to 25th July, 1828, were ordinarily in force. Thus the marriage law in Victoria remains on this point as it was (and also as the law in England was) prior to the passing of Lord LYNDBURST'S Act in 1835. That marriages within the prohibited degrees are voidable only and not void in Victoria, and such other Australian States as have not altered their statute law in accordance with Lord LYNDBURST'S Act, has been determined by the High Court of Australia in the case of *Miller v. Major* (1906, 6 Comms. L. R. 219), which was an appeal from the New South Wales Courts. Leave to appeal from this decision of the High Court of Australia was refused by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in November, 1911.

The Marriage Law in other Australian States.

It is believed that the law as to marriages within the prohibited degrees being voidable only and not void is the same in Queensland and Tasmania as in New South Wales and Victoria. In South Australia and Western Australia a different rule prevails, and the English Act of 1835 (Lord LYNDBURST'S Act) is in force in those two States, though for different reasons. In South Australia English statutes enacted prior to 28th December, 1836, are ordinarily in force, so that the change of law made in England on 31st August, 1835, took effect in South Australia on that date also. In Western

Australia the rule probably was that English statutes passed in 1835 were not in force. However, in 1844 Lord LYNDBURST'S Act was by a local enactment of the Western Australian Legislature expressly introduced into local law. At the present day Western Australia is therefore, on this point, in the same position as South Australia. It seems the more desirable to call attention to the circumstance that the law is not the same in all the Australian States with respect to marriage within the prohibited degrees, because on one point—marriage with deceased wife's sister—these States have for some time been on the same footing, and there is a widespread belief that "Australian" marriage law is one and indivisible.

Mortgage Interest Under the Rent Restriction Act, 1920.

A MORTGAGE invariably provides for payment of interest at an agreed rate until default in payment of principal at the date fixed for redemption—i.e., usually at the end of six months—and then to pay interest at the same rate until actual payment of the principal. Before considering how a mortgagee can increase the rate of interest under the Increase of Rent, &c., Act, 1920, it is necessary to consider how he could do it apart from the Act. In the ordinary course he would give three months' notice to call in the mortgage, and at the end of the three months he would withdraw the notice on the mortgagor agreeing to pay a higher rate of interest. This agreement would be under seal and indorsed on the mortgage. He can also compel an agreement to raise the rate of interest immediately under a threat to enter or to commence foreclosure proceedings, but this would be unusual. Now Dr. WATSON said in his letter last week (*ante*, p. 683) that the Act is a disabling, not an enabling statute, and, if this is so, the mortgagee must in the above manner—or, as Dr. WATSON suggests, by intimating that he intends to call in the mortgage—put himself in a position to obtain and actually obtain an agreement from the mortgagor to pay an increased rate, and it is not essential that the agreement should be under seal. An agreement in writing or merely verbal is sufficient, provided there is a new and good consideration, such as the forbearance by the mortgagee to enforce the mortgage: see *Milton v. Edgeworth* (5 Bro. P. C. 313); *Fisher's Law of Mortgage*, 6th ed., p. 926.

But the Act places obstacles in the way of the mortgagee adopting any of these courses. It permits a certain increase in rent, and provides that so long as the permitted rate is paid he shall not call in his mortgage or take any steps for enforcing his security: section 7 (a). No doubt if the mortgagor does not at once pay the increased rate, then he is not protected and the mortgage can be called in; but directly he pays the increased rate he is protected, and the notice ceases to have effect; in other words, the payment of the increase is not made as the result of agreement, but in order to secure the protection of the Act. The only conclusion which seems to give consistency to the matter is to drop the idea of the increase being the result of any actual agreement, and to attribute it solely to the statute. It can be called a statutory agreement. It follows that all that a mortgagee has to do is to give notice that as from 2nd July the interest will be increased up to the permitted rate—i.e., in the case of a house now for the first time protected, the rate may be increased by 1 per cent., with a limit of 6½ per cent.; as to houses formerly protected, by ½ per cent. the first year and ½ per cent. the second year, up to the same limit. Technically it may be possible to attack this result; practically it seems to us correct.

Dr. WATSON suggested a difficulty depending on the words "but for this Act" in section 3 (1). Evidently the draftsman did not notice that "but for this Act" the previous Acts would be in force. But the Court would not, we think, allow his mistake to have practical effect. It would construe "this Act" as, for this purpose, including the earlier Acts

which it replaces, and with which, if it were not a consolidating Act, it would be directed to be read. And Dr. PYKE, in a letter which we print elsewhere, raises a similar point with regard to the Courts (Emergency Powers) Acts. The answer probably is that these Acts do not prevent the enforcement of the security; they only require the leave of the Court. Hence it was not essential to specify this in section 3 (1) of the present Act. Another correspondent has asked us to give a form of notice for raising the rate of interest. In the view we have taken above we think it is sufficient simply to give notice that—

"Under and in accordance with the provisions of the Increase of Rent and Mortgage Interest (Restrictions) Act, 1920, the rate of interest payable under the mortgage dated, &c., and made between yourself and [the mortgagee] will, as from 2nd July, 1920, be raised from — p.c. to — p.c."

That no more than a notice of this kind is required in order to make the increased rate payable appears to be confirmed by the provisions of the Act with regard to the increase of rent. Of course, no such increase is permissible until the term of the tenancy is at an end, but then it can be effected by mere notice, and the form of the notice is given in the first schedule; certain restrictions as regards raising the rent under the notice are imposed by section 3 (2). No such restrictions are imposed as regards a notice to increase mortgage interest, and the date for redemption corresponds to the determination of the tenancy. At any time after that date a notice raising the interest can be given. The point shortly is that the Act forbids the mortgagee to enforce his security, and, on the other hand, allows him concurrently with this prohibition to demand a higher rate of interest.

The Statutory Tenancy Under the Rent Restriction Act.

II.—INCIDENCE OF THE STATUTORY TENANCY.

In our last article it was pointed out that the Rent Restriction Act of 1920, now in force, creates explicitly a new form of statutory tenancy as between the owner and occupier of certain premises. The effect of this constructive contract, created by operation of law, it was pointed out, is to provide (1) security of tenure, (2) a fair rent, and (3) certain modifications of the common law obligations as regards repairs in the case of all landlords and tenants who come within the ambit of its provisions. But not all landlords and tenants do so come. The incidence (or scope) of the statute is confined to certain premises, in the occupation of certain persons, for a certain period of time. Outside these limits the Act has no operation. We have therefore to consider first of all: (1) The premises to which the Act applies; (2) the parties between whom the statutory contract is created; (3) the period during which the statutory tenancy continues. The provisions in the first two of those matters are somewhat complicated, and we will devote this article to stating them as clearly as we can.

(1) *Premises to which the Act Applies.*—Now, one might have expected the statute to state in one of its earlier sections the scope of its application. This it does not do. On the contrary, sections 1 to 11 set out at length the things which are to happen "in the case of any dwelling-house to which this Act applies," and we have to read on until we come to the definition clause, section 12, before we discover what are the "dwelling-houses to which this Act applies." Even then, the first half of the section is taken up with all sorts of other definitions; it is the second half which for the first time condescends to set out the premises to which the Act applies.

Subject to certain modifications set out in section 18, the statute applies to Scotland and Ireland as well as to England. In Scotland the limit of rental or rateable value is £90; in Ireland it is the same as in England. * We will not therefore refer further to those lesser portions of the United Kingdom,

but will hereafter assume that we are concerned with England (and Wales) alone.

Now, as regards England, the statute applies only to houses of a certain rental, nor yet to all such houses. Before premises come within the Act they must satisfy the following conditions:—

(i.) The premises must be either "a house or a part of a house let as a separate dwelling," and every such part of a house is to be deemed to be a separate dwelling-house to which the Act applies; but it does not, save as otherwise expressly provided, apply where the rent includes payments in respect of board, attendance, or use of furniture: section 12 (2). This seems beautifully clear. But then the Act goes on to say that (subject to certain modifications) it is to apply "to any premises used for business, trade or professional purposes, or for the public service," as it applies to a "dwelling-house": section 13 (1). So that, within the prescribed limits, the Act really applies to (a) unfurnished dwelling-houses; (b) unfurnished business premises; (c) unfurnished trading premises; (d) unfurnished professional chambers; (e) unfurnished public buildings; though in cases (b) to (e) the Act only operates for one year. But it does not apply to furnished houses or parts of houses except so far as a special provision is enacted in section 9 limiting the profits of letting such premises.

(ii.) The dwelling-house (or premises to be deemed such) must have been in existence before 2nd April, 1919: section 12 (9). A house erected since that date, or even one commenced at that date, is outside the Act. There are, however, certain statutory regulations enacted in this sub-section to govern the rating of such houses. Put generally, these treat the house as if its rateable value were that of a similar house erected before 3rd August, 1914, an important provision in view of the great increase in cost of building.

(iii.) The house must not be a converted flat, the conversion being subsequent to, or in progress on, 2nd April, 1919: section 12 (9).

(iv.) The house must not be business premises let at a market or fair where the rent or conditions of tenancy are regulated by statute or charter: section 13 (2).

(v.) The house must be one in respect of which the "standard rent" (i.e., rent on 3rd August, 1914) or the rateable value does not exceed—(a) in the City and the Metropolitan Police District (roughly an area extending about fifteen miles from Charing Cross), £105 per annum; (b) in Scotland, £90; (c) elsewhere, £78. It sometimes happens that one tenancy agreement comprises two or more flats or parts of a house: in such case there is only one "separate dwelling-house," so that the combined rent and rateable value is the test of applicability: *Rider v. Rollitt* (1920, W. N. 227). Where part of the premises is used as a shop, even as licensed premises, the Act still applies, provided the rental, &c., is within the statutory limits: section 12 (2), proviso (ii.); see also *Epsom Grand Stand Association (Limited) v. Clarke* (63 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 642; 35 T. L. R. 525).

It should also be noted that a house is not excluded from the benefit of the statutory protection merely because the standard rent is above £105, if the rateable value is below that figure; or merely because the rateable value is above £105, if the standard rent is below it. Normally, of course, when a house is let, the rateable value is the rental which would be paid by "a hypothetical tenant doing his own repairs," and therefore is considerably lower than the rent, about 4-5ths or 5-6ths of the latter. But there are abnormal cases where the tenant has contracted to do all repairs, or for some other special reason pays a rent less than the rateable value. In the case of parts of a house let separately, and therefore treated as separate dwelling-houses, it is often difficult to ascertain what part of the standard rent or the rateable value applies to the part in dispute. The county court is given power to apportion this: section 12 (3).

(vi.) The house must not include land, other than its own site, let in the same tenancy agreement. Where the land held with the house is less than a quarter in rateable value of the

house, it will be deemed to be part of the site. Where a quarter or more of that value, it will be deemed not to be the site, and the house will be excluded from the protection of the Act: section 12 (2), proviso (iii.). For example, two houses and gardens standing side by side are assessed to the rates at £100 per annum. In the case of house A, the rateable value of the house is £90 and of the land £10. In the case of B, the two rateable values are £80 and £20 respectively. A is within the statute, B is without the statute.

(vii.) The house must either (a) have been let on 3rd August, 1914, or (b) have been let since that date and also before the Act; or (c) be first let at some date prior to June, 1923, when the Act expires. This follows from the definition of "standard rent" in section 12 (1).

(viii.) The house must not be let at a rental which includes either (a) board, or (b) attendance, or (c) the use of furniture: section 12 (2), proviso (i.). But there are special provisions in sections 9 and 10 restricting the profits on the letting of furnished houses.

(2) *The Parties to the Statutory Tenancy.*—Since the Act creates a constructive contract, it is necessary to ascertain who are the parties to that contract. In the normal case these are the parties to the original tenancy in existence before 3rd August, 1914, namely, the lessor and the lessee, provided that tenancy has been "novated" and replaced by the statutory tenancy in the manner to be described in our next article. But there are certain abnormal cases which require a moment's consideration.

(i.) The Act only applies where there has been a "letting" of the premises at a rent from which the standard rent can be calculated. Suppose the present occupier was a squatter at the crucial date, 3rd August, 1914. Still he was a tenant on sufferance, and the rent must be adjudged, if need be, by the county court judge.

(ii.) Suppose the house has a rental of £100, and so has only just come within the statutory protection. Suppose, also, that the tenant was in on 2nd August, 1914, but that his tenancy had been determined lawfully by a notice to quit since that date: is he protected? The answer seems to be: Yes, if he still remains in the premises, but No, if he has gone out: *Dobson v. Richards* (1919, W. N. 166). No matter what, if any, the new terms on which he has "held over," he can claim statutory protection.

(iii.) Suppose "landlord" or "tenant" has assigned his respective interest in the house since 3rd August, 1914. The definition of "landlord" and "tenant" in section 12 (1) (f) includes "any person from time to time deriving title under the original landlord, tenant, &c." There are peculiar provisions in the statute governing the position of purchasers since 3rd August, 1914. These can be more appropriately discussed in our article on "Termination of the Statutory Tenancy." Here it is sufficient to note that, put broadly, assignees, either of the landlord or of the tenant, are parties to the statutory tenancy.

(iv.) Suppose the "landlord," as defined by the sub-section just quoted, is excluded by the re-entry of someone with an over-riding title—e.g., a ground landlord enforcing forfeiture, a mortgagee foreclosing on his security, an evicted owner ejecting a squatter, a reversioner succeeding the holder of a preceding estate, &c. What happens then? The new owner, so coming in, is brought within the definition of landlord and bound by the Act: section 12 (1) (g). The same paragraph makes a similar provision for the case of sub-tenants standing in the shoes of the tenant, except where the tenant sub-let with breach of a covenant: section 5 (5), and *Cottell v. Baker* (ante, p. 276; 36 T. L. R. 208).

(3) *The Period of the Statutory Tenancy.*—This may be commented on very briefly. The statutory tenancy commences only when there has been a novation under the Act, in manner to be described in our next article. It expires on 24th June, 1923, in the case of dwelling-houses, and on 24th June, 1921, in the case of business premises.

Correspondence.

The Law of Property Bill.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—Your comments upon the Lord Chancellor's statement in opposition to Lord Galway's amendment to omit sub-clause 4 of clause 177 of this Bill will, I am sure, receive the approval of those who are dealing every day with conveyancing, and it is greatly to be hoped that any attempt to extend the present system of registration will be strongly opposed with a view, at any rate, to postponement of such extension until the existing system has been amended and experience of its working gained.

It may safely be said that those members of the House of Lords who advocated extended compulsion never carried through a conveyancing transaction in their lives, while the same might probably—with equal safety—be said of those composing the majority who voted against a most desirable amendment. It might surely be left to the local authority to say how land in its area should be dealt with.

You do not refer to another point, viz., that an extension of the registration system will mean the creation of a swarm of new officials.

Lord Buckmaster says he dislikes intensely any form of bureaucracy, but, if the sub-clause under discussion is passed as it stands, he will soon find his dislike intensified, for the present Government will not hesitate to live the swarm.

The Lord Chancellor says that in "Middlesex" (he no doubt means "London") he had found no one occupying an official position who would dream of reverting to the old system. Probably not; but what an argument! Surely the evidence and wishes of landowners, dealers in land and their advisers, and of local authorities, should have more weight than the views of officials.

When will some people understand that the interposition of officials between business men engaged in a business transaction almost invariably means delay, expense and trouble?

J. ROWLAND HOPWOOD.

13, South-square, Gray's Inn, 2nd August.

Increase of Rent and Mortgage Interest (Restrictions) Act.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—When dealing with mortgage interest, perhaps you would be good enough to consider the effect of the Courts (Emergency Powers) Acts in regard to the provision in section 3 of the Increase of Rent &c. Act, 1920, negating any increase in the rate of interest on a mortgage except in respect of a period during which, "but for this Act," the security could be enforced.

Primâ facie, the Emergency Acts would appear to present greater difficulties to mortgagees—in the case of mortgages to which they apply—than the previous Rent Restrictions Acts to which Dr. Watson refers in his letter of 24th July.

H. REASON PYKE.

Bankside, Upper Tooting Park, London, S.W. 17.
2nd August.

Book of the Week.

Digest.—Mews' Digest of English Case Law, Quarterly Issue, July, 1920. This Part contains Cases Reported from January 1 to July 1, 1920. (This Part incorporates and supercedes the previous one.) By AUBREY J. SPENCER, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons (Limited); Sweet & Maxwell (Limited). Annual subscription, 26s. post free.

The following letter was read from the Chief Constable of Essex at a meeting of Billericay Rural Council on Tuesday:—"I am fully aware of the disorderly conduct in many instances on the part of pleasure-seekers using char-a-bancs in this county. The problem is a difficult one, and in many respects beyond the powers of the police adequately to deal with. It is, however, a problem which must be dealt with, as char-a-bancs have probably come to stay, and the nuisance will continue unless adequate provisions are made to prevent, or, at all events, to check it. I am in communication with the Home Office on the subject, as the matter would appear to require local or Imperial legislation. Meanwhile, the police will take such steps as are possible to bring offenders to justice."

CASES OF LAST SITTINGS.

Court of Appeal.

MEADOWS v. ELLERMAN LINES (LIM.). No. 1. 8th and 9th June; 30th July.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION—INDUSTRIAL DISEASE—ANTHRAX—DEATH OF DOCK LABOURER—NATURE OF EMPLOYMENT—PROCESS OF HANDLING HIDES AND SKINS—ONUS OF PROOF—WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1906 (6 Ed. 7, c. 58), s. 8 (2), SCHEDULE III.

A foreman dock labourer died of anthrax, a disease specified in Schedule III. of the Workmen's Compensation Act as liable to be incurred in the process of "handling of . . . hides and skins." The deceased workman was in charge of a gang which was frequently employed in loading hides and skins into ships, and whether so employed or not, had constantly to pass through sheds where quantities of hides and skins were stored. On a claim for compensation being made by his dependants, the county court judge dismissed the application on the ground that the workman was not proved to have been physically engaged in handling hides or skins at or immediately before his disablement.

Held, a misdirection. On the evidence, this was part, though not the whole, of his regular duties, and that being so, he was employed in a scheduled process immediately before his disablement, and therefore there was a presumption, which the employers offered no evidence to displace, that his death was due to injury caused by the nature of his employment.

Appeal by the defendants from a decision of his Honour Judge Thomas of the Liverpool County Court. The facts of the case are fully stated in the judgment of the Court, which was delivered by Atkin, L.J. *Cur. adv. vult.*

ATKIN, L.J.—In this case the deceased workman was the foreman of a gang of dock labourers employed by the respondents in loading and unloading their ships in the Liverpool Docks. On the 10th November, 1919, he died of anthrax, which is one of the diseases named in Schedule III. to the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906. The applicants, his dependants, claim compensation on the ground that his death was due to the nature of the employment in which he was employed within the twelve months previous to his death. The question that arises upon this appeal is whether the applicants are entitled to the benefit of the onus of proof conferred by section 8, sub-section 2, of the Act. If they are, the learned county court judge has held that the employers have not rebutted the presumption that the disease was due to the nature of the employment. If they are not, he has held that the applicants have not discharged the onus which is upon them of proving that the disease was due to the nature of the employment. The learned county court judge came to the conclusion that the applicants were not within sub-section 2, and he therefore made his award in favour of the respondents. The question turns upon the construction of sub-section 2: "If the workman at or immediately before the date of the disablement or suspension was employed in any process mentioned in the second column of the Third Schedule to this Act, and the disease contracted is the disease in the first column of that schedule set opposite the description of the process, the disease, except where the certifying surgeon certifies that in his opinion the disease was not due to the nature of the employment, shall be deemed to have been due to the nature of that employment, unless the employer proves the contrary." The words "employ" and "employment" are capable of two meanings which are apt to cause confusion. They may relate to the general nature of a servant's employment, they may be confined to the particular work or job which he is doing under his contract of service at any particular moment of time. One must judge their true meaning in any particular case by the context. In this sub-section I am of opinion that they relate to the general nature of the workman's service. The scheme of the Act seems to be that, if the workman is disabled by one of the diseases mentioned in the schedule, and can show that the disease was due to the nature of his employment, he can recover as for an accident arising out of and in the course of his employment. To discharge that onus, apart from the sub-section, it would not be sufficient to prove that the disease is one generally associated with the nature of the employment; it would be necessary to show the cause or connection, that the disease was due to the employment. But in the case of certain diseases which are more closely associated with particular industries the Legislature has thought fit to enact that, if a workman who is employed in that industry suffers from the particular associated disease, he is relieved in the first instance from giving further proof of particular facts tending to show that the industry caused the disease in him. The inference is complete unless the employer can negative the connection. No doubt he may do this by either proving affirmatively the disease was caused by an indicated independent cause, or by showing that the actual work or job on which the workman was employed was such that within the period of possible infection or origin of the disease the disease could not possibly be due to the nature of the employment. The word used in the third column is a general word, "process." In the schedule to the Act and in the amending Orders of 30th July, 1913, 1st July, 1914, and 7th July, 1915, the description of the processes are in many cases wide terms, including in relation to several diseases "mining." In this particular case the process with which anthrax is associated is described as

"Handling of wool, hair, bristles, hides, and skins." If, then, the employment of the deceased workman, used in the wider sense, was the handling of hides and skins, &c., and if the workman was in such employment at or immediately before the disablement, it was unnecessary for him to prove in the first instance that his particular job at or immediately before disablement was handling skins or hides. The Act draws the necessary inference for him unless the employer can rebut it. On the undisputed facts in this case it appears to me that the workman was employed in the process of handling of hides and skins. His duties necessarily involved his doing so. We have the evidence of some of his particular jobs for a period of a month before his death. From the 9th to the 14th of October he was unloading hides from *The Como*. Gloves were served out to him for his gang for the express purpose of protecting them from infection. On the 30th October, 31st October, and 1st November he was loading No. 2 hold of *The Lesseps*; there were two bales of black skins. In No. 1 hold, worked by another gang there were hides. From 3rd November he was loading *The Trentino* with general cargo. But in addition to the particular cargo, the sheds of the Ellerman Line were full of hides; it was very seldom in the year that there would not be hides in the shed; and the dock labourers would have to handle the hides to make a gangway or to extricate a case. The duties of handling are not confined to the labourers in the gang; the foreman would lend a hand. It is, I think, impossible to limit the description of the process "handling hides" to an employment which consists of handling hides and nothing else. On the other hand, it would seem illogical to cast the onus upon the employer in cases where the employment is ordinarily innocuous, and handling hides is only a casual incident, and not one of the regular duties of the employment; or in cases where, though handling hides is one of the regular duties of the employment at varying times or seasons, yet it was not part of the regular duties at or immediately before the disablement. In such cases the workman must be left to prove that the disablement was due to the nature of his employment. But where handling of hides forms part of the regular duties of the employment at or immediately before the disablement, then even though the workman was not engaged on the particular job of handling hides at or immediately before the disablement, the onus is upon the employer. In the present case it was established beyond controversy that the regular duties of the employment at the material period included the duty of handling hides. The workman, therefore, was employed in the scheduled process, and was in such employment at or immediately before the disablement. It appears to me for the reason I have given, with great respect to the learned and very careful county court judge, that he was in error in confining his attention to the question whether the actual job of the workman at or immediately before disablement was handling hides; and that his finding of fact in that respect becomes irrelevant. The applicants were entitled under the sub-section to an award unless the employers negatived the presumption, and as the learned judge has found that the employers failed in this respect the appeal must be allowed with costs here and below, and the award made in favour of the applicants, and the case be remitted to the county court judge to give the necessary directions.—**COUNSEL**, Langdon, K.C., and Caradoc Rees; Greaves-Lord, K.C., and Layton. **SOLICITORS**, Tippet & Co., for J. W. Wall, Bootle; Pritchard & Sons, for Blackburn Wright, Liverpool.

[Reported by H. LANGFORD LEWIS, Barrister-at-Law.]

FISHER, REEVES & CO. v. ARMOUR & CO. No. 2. 15th July.

SALE OF GOODS—SALE "EX STORE"—GOODS IN LIGHTERS—REPUDIATION OF CONTRACT.

By a verbal contract of November, 1919, the plaintiffs bought from the defendants certain goods ex store Rotterdam. The plaintiffs, before taking actual delivery, became aware that the goods were, and had been for some considerable time, in lighters, and they repudiated the contract on the ground that the goods, being in lighters, could not be sold "ex store," and they claimed to recover the amount they had paid.

Held, that the general meaning of "ex store" would not include "ex lighter," and that there was nothing in the circumstances of the present case to warrant the Court giving any but the ordinary meaning to the words "ex store," which in the case of frozen meat meant "ex refrigerating store," and did not include a marine risk.

Decision of Bailhache, J. (64 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 478; 1920, 2 K. B. 329), *reversed*.

Appeal by the plaintiffs in an action tried by Bailhache, J., in the Commercial Court. By a verbal agreement the plaintiffs bought from the defendants 500 cases of South American boiled beef apot Rotterdam at 22.25 dollars a case. The defendants subsequently wrote to the plaintiffs as follows:—"Referring to . . . the 500 cases . . . boiled beef which you recently bought from us ex store Rotterdam . . ." The plaintiffs, before taking actual delivery, became aware that the goods were, and had been, owing to the warehouse being crowded at the time, for a considerable while in lighters, and they repudiated the contract on the ground that the goods, being in lighters, could not be sold ex store, and they claimed to recover the amount they had paid. Bailhache, J., found that large quantities of goods had been sent to Rotterdam in the hope that they could be forwarded to Germany, but owing to financial difficulties, due mainly to the fall of the mark, Germany did not take the goods to the extent anticipated, consequently there was a glut of goods in Rotterdam, the warehouses were full, and large quantities of goods were known to be stored in lighters, which were very large, and

capable of carrying as much as 1,000 tons. He held that the word "store" had no specific meaning, but was a general term which might appropriately be used to describe any place in which goods were, in fact, for the time being stored. In his opinion goods stored in the lighters could be sold *ex store* as store was not equivalent to warehouse, but was a general term, which might properly be used for any storage place. The plaintiffs appealed.

BANKES, L.J., in giving judgment, said the appeal had been treated as one from a decision given by the trial judge of general application as to the meaning of the words "goods *ex store*," when they were used in a contract for the sale of goods. They had been told that business men had regarded the judgment as one not in accordance with their general practice. Counsel for the defendant had not defended the judgment as one of general application, but he had sought to say that the judgment was correct, having regard to the special circumstances then existing at Rotterdam. Two questions arose: (1) What was the contract? Was it one for the sale of goods "*ex store*," or was it a spot contract? and (2) assuming it was a contract for the sale of the goods "*ex store*," what was the meaning of the expression "*ex store*"? On the evidence, the contract between the parties was for the sale of these goods "*ex store*." Apart from special circumstances, what did the words "*ex store*" mean? It was easier to say what was not *ex store* than to define what was *ex store*. Certainly, goods *ex lighter* or *ex wharf* were not goods *ex store*. There was evidence that when the goods were landed they had been put in a shed, but that owing to the lack of store accommodation they had been put back into the lighters. In those circumstances the defendants' counsel said that the goods could properly be described as goods "*ex store*." His lordship did not accede to that contention. He thought that it was enough to say that goods in lighters or in a ship could not properly be described as *ex store*. The plaintiffs, therefore, were justified in declining to take the goods.

SCRUTTON, L.J., agreed. The expression *ex store* could not possibly cover *ex lighter* or *ex quay*. *Ex store* in frozen meat meant *ex refrigerating store*. *Ex store* did not mean a marine risk; it meant a store on land.

EVJ, J.—The contract was clearly to sell *ex store* Rotterdam. In the absence of special circumstances, the expression *ex store* had the same meaning as *ex warehouse*. Here there were no special circumstances, and the decision below was wrong.—COUNSEL, for the appellants, *Hustings, K.C.*, and *Jowett*; *Stuart Bevan, K.C.*, and *Cloughton Scott, Solicitors*; *Como Cran & Co.*; *William A. Crump & Son*.

[Reported by ESKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

NICHOLSON v. JACKSON. No. 2. 26th and 27th July.

EMERGENCY LEGISLATION—LANDLORD AND TENANT—INCREASE OF RATES—INCREASE OF RENT—COMPOUNDING LANDLORD—RIGHT TO TRANSFER INCREASE OF RATES TO TENANT—POOR RATE ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION ACT, 1869 (32 & 33 VICT. c. 41), ss. 3, 4, 5, 8, 11—INCREASE OF RENT, &c. (WAR RESTRICTIONS) ACT, 1915 (5 & 6 GEO. 5, c. 97), s. 1 (iv.), (vi.).

The plaintiff, the landlord of a dwelling-house, had, under section 3 of the Poor Rate Assessment and Collection Act, 1869, agreed with the overerssers to pay the poor rate, whether the house was occupied or not; and the overerssers had agreed to allow him a commission of 25 per cent. on the amount so paid. Before the war the rates paid by the plaintiff came to £1 9s. 8d. per half-year, but had twice been increased half-yearly to £2 17s. 2d., and the plaintiff, under section 1, sub-section (1) (iv.), of the Increase of Rent, &c. Act, 1915, raised the rent of his tenant, the defendant, so as to transfer the whole of the £1 7s. 6d. additional rate to him.

The defendant contended that, since the plaintiff, as a compounding landlord, was receiving 25 per cent. commission, he could only raise the rent by the net amount of the increase, and not the full amount.

Held (Scrutton, L.J., dissenting), that the word "rates" in the Act of 1915 meant the actual amount of the rates paid by the landlord.

Decision of the Divisional Court (reported 18 L.G. Rep. 418) reversed.

Appeal by the tenant, the defendant in the action, from a decision of the Divisional Court (Salter and Roche, JJ.), holding that upon the true construction of the Increase of Rent, &c. (War Restrictions) Act, 1915, the words "rates" meant the full amount of the rates assessed, and therefore whether the landlord who paid the rates had compounded he was, nevertheless, entitled to add the full amount of the increase in the rates on the tenant, although the amount of the rates ultimately paid by him were subject to the compounding commission of 25 per cent. The facts sufficiently appear from the headnote.

BANKES, L.J., in giving judgment, said that in this case the Divisional Court had reversed a decision of the county court judge of Pontefract in favour of the tenant in a claim by the landlord for increased rent of a dwelling-house in Victoria-street, Allerton, Bywater, which was occupied by the defendant, Mr. Jackson, as a weekly tenant, the landlord, Mrs. Nicholson, paying the rates. The question turned on the construction of section 1, sub-section (1) (iv.), of the Increase of Rent, &c. Act, 1915. The Act was one of a series of Acts which had been passed for the benefit of tenants, and, as its title indicated, it was designed to prevent landlords from increasing the rents of small dwellings. The sub-section above referred to was as follows:—"(iv.) Where the landlord pays the rates chargeable on, or which, but for the enactments relating to compounding, would be chargeable

on the occupier of any dwelling-house, an increase of the rent of the dwelling-house shall not be deemed to be an increase for the purposes of this Act if the amount of the increase does not exceed any increase in the amount for the time being payable by the landlord in respect of such rates over the corresponding amount paid in respect of yearly, half-yearly, or other period which included the third day of August, 1914, and for the purpose of this proviso the expression "rates" includes water rents and charges." Its object was to allow landlords in certain cases to pass on to the tenant the additional burden placed on the landlords by an increase of rates since August, 1914. Only certain classes of landlords were entitled to do so under the section. The word "pays" in connection with the landlord and rates in the earlier part of the sub-section described the class of landlord who would come within the province of the section. What was the burden it was intended by the sub-section should be passed on to the tenant? It had been argued that it was a notional burden, but that contention was inconsistent with the object of the Act. The burden was arrived at by comparing two things—the amount for the time being payable for rates and the corresponding amount paid for the period which included 3rd August, 1914. The draughtsman used the word "paid" in a different context from that in which he used it in the earlier part of the sub-section. If the landlord was asked what he paid for the period including 3rd August, 1914, his answer must be the actual amount that he paid. Like must be compared with like, and therefore the obvious meaning to be attributable to words was the actual amount and not the notional amount. He agreed with the judgment, therefore, of the county court judge that the amount alone chargeable on the tenant was the actual amount paid by the compounding owner.

SCRUTTON, L.J., said he was not prepared to differ from the very careful judgment of Salter, J., concurred in as it was by Roche, J., When the Act of 1915 was passed, there had been in force for over fifty years a system by which an owner compounded for his rates under the Act of 1869. Under section 1 of that Act the rates chargeable to the occupier were clearly the whole 100 per cent., but there were great advantages to the local authorities by the owners becoming liable for the rates of small houses arising from delay in getting them paid, and the risk of the house being empty for a time. The commission allowed the landlord was for services he rendered to the local authority. Section 3 clearly contemplated the owner becoming liable for the full 100 per cent. There were other clauses in the Act which indicated that the transfer was to be at the full rate (sections 7, 8, 11). Bearing in mind that commission was paid for services rendered, he thought that the landlord was *prima facie* liable for the full amount of the increase, and was therefore entitled to put the whole of the increase upon the tenant. That was the opinion expressed by the judges of the Divisional Court, and he could not hold that it was wrong. Therefore, in his opinion, the appeal failed. His lordship added that it was difficult to see how the tenant would gain by the present appeal, because under the Increase of Rent Act, 1920, the landlord was entitled to increase the "net rent" by 40 per cent., and therefore the smaller the rate deducted for the purpose of ascertaining the net rent, the larger would be the amount of rent to which the 40 per cent. increase would apply.

ATKIN, L.J., agreed with Bankes, L.J., and therefore, by a majority, the appeal was allowed with costs.—COUNSEL, for the appellant, *Compston, K.C.*, and *W. de B. Herbert*; for the respondent, *Inskip, K.C.*, and *Hon. H. O. Henn-Collins*. SOLICITORS, *T. D. Jones & Co.*, for *N. Stanley Grant*, Castleford, Yorkshire; *Herbert W. R. Denne*, for *B. E. Poppleston*, Castleford, Yorkshire.

[Reported by ESKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—Chancery Division.

RECKITT v. CODY. Eve, J. 9th July.

VENDOR AND PURCHASER—FREEHOLD ESTATE—RESTRICTIVE COVENANT—PRIVATE DWELLING HOUSE—CONVEYANCE SUBJECT TO COVENANT—COVENANT TO INDEMNIFY.

Land was conveyed to the plaintiff subject to a covenant not to erect any building otherwise than as a private dwelling house. The plaintiff conveyed part of the land to the defendant, who covenanted to perform and observe the said covenant. The defendant erected a corrugated iron shed on the land conveyed to him.

Held, that the covenant by the defendant was a mere covenant of indemnity, and as the original vendor had not taken any proceedings, there was no cause of action.

Held, also, that the erection complained of was a breach of the covenant.

This was an action to restrain the defendant from erecting or using a building otherwise than as a private dwelling house. In 1911 the plaintiff became the owner of a freehold estate, and covenanted with his vendor to observe and perform certain covenants. These included one that no house to be erected on the land should be used for any other purpose than that of a private dwelling house, and that no hut, shed or other chattel intended to be used as a dwelling house should be erected or allowed to remain. In July, 1919, the plaintiff conveyed to the defendant part of the land conveyed to him in 1911 subject to the restrictive covenants and stipulations contained in the conveyance to him of 1911, and the defendant for herself, her heirs and assigns (with intent to bind the hereditaments thereby conveyed, but not so as to be

personally liable after she had parted with the same), did covenant with the plaintiff, his heirs and assigns, to perform and observe the said restrictive covenants and stipulations so far as regarded the land thereby conveyed. In October, 1919, the defendant erected on the land conveyed to her a detached building which was described in the defence as a portable corrugated iron sectional shed to be used as a class-room for boys. The plaintiff alleged that it was an unsightly design and detrimental to the amenities of an estate of a purely residential character. The defence was that the shed was not a building, and that the restrictive covenant was no longer subsisting or capable of taking effect.

EVES, J.—The point was raised by counsel for the defendant that in the events which happened the covenant in the conveyance of July, 1919, was not one which the vendor was in a position to enforce, inasmuch as it was a covenant of indemnity only, and as the person who under the conveyance of 1911 could take proceedings had taken none against the plaintiff in respect of what the defendant had done, the plaintiff had no cause of action. In support of that argument the cases of *Re Poole and Clarke's Contract* (1904, 2 Ch. 173) and *Harrie v. Bood's Cash Chemists* (1904, 2 Ch. 376) were relied upon. In the former case the Court recognized that where the covenant in an assignment of a lease was in the form almost universally adopted, or where it was preceded by the prefatory statement of its intention, it was and still remained merely a covenant of indemnity; and the other case cited was to the same effect. The question was whether in a conveyance of freeholds a covenant of this character ought to receive the same construction. In the case of an assignment of leaseholds the covenant was usually to observe and perform and then in terms a covenant to indemnify. In the present case it was only a covenant to observe and perform, and in the absence of special circumstances which would impose upon the covenant a different meaning, it was according to the authorities a mere covenant of indemnity. Accordingly, upon the true construction of the covenant, it followed that, as the original vendor had not taken any proceedings, there did not exist a cause of action when the writ was issued. The covenant in the present case was in effect to perform all the affirmative stipulations and to observe all the negative stipulations with which reference was made, and it could be enforced by an injunction. With regard to the question of fact, it appeared on the evidence that the erection complained of was not actually affixed to the freehold, and in any case it constituted a breach of the covenant which prohibited the erection of a house for any other purpose than that of a private dwelling house. But having regard to the decision on the first point the action would be dismissed with costs.—**COUNSEL, Gover, K.C., and H. E. Wright; Courthope Wilson, K.C., and Trapnell, Solicitors, Wreford Brown, Hewett & Co.; Nicholls & Co., for Hobbs & Brutton, Portsmouth.**

[Reported by S. E. WILLIAMS, Barrister-at-Law.]

Re KELANTAN COCONUT ESTATES (LIMITED AND REDUCED).
Astbury, J. 6th July.

COMPANY—QUORUM—CONFIRMATORY MEETING FOR REDUCTION OF CAPITAL—PERSON REPRESENTING SHAREHOLDER COMPANY—COMPANIES (CONSOLIDATION) ACT, 1908 (8 ED. 7, c. 69), s. 68.

A person appointed to represent a limited company shareholder under section 68 of the Companies (Consolidation) Act, 1908, can be taken into account in considering whether or not there is a quorum of shareholders present.

There was only one question on this petition for reduction of capital, as to whether the special resolution had been duly passed or not. The facts were as follows: By article 73 of the companies articles of association it was provided that two members personally present should be a quorum. There were present at the confirmatory meeting one member of the company and one person appointed as representative under section 68 of the Companies (Consolidation) Act, 1908, to represent a certain limited company which was a shareholder of the above company, and it was contended for the petitioners that there was a quorum.

ASTBURY, J., after stating the facts, said:—In my judgment a representative member appointed under section 68 of the Companies (Consolidation) Act, 1908, should be taken into account in considering whether there is a quorum of members present at a meeting or not. I accordingly hold that this meeting was duly constituted, and I confirm the reduction of capital.—**COUNSEL, Henry Johnston. SOLICITOR, E. F. Hunt.**

[Reported by LEONARD MAY, Barrister-at-Law.]

Re ELLIS' SETTLEMENT. WASBROUGH v. BOYCE. Sargant, J.
15th and 16th July.

SETTLEMENT—PREVIOUS MARRIAGE OF WIFE—CHILD OF PREVIOUS MARRIAGE—MEANING OF WORDS "WITHOUT HAVING BEEN MARRIED."

Where there is no context, or surrounding circumstances, pointing to the view that the words "without having been married," mean without having entered into the marriage then contemplated, they will be taken to mean "without ever having been married."

This was a summons which raised the question whether, on the true construction of a settlement, the trust funds ought to be held in trust for the son of the first marriage or for the persons who, under the Statutes for the Distribution of the Effects of Intestates would have become entitled thereto on the decease of the said Mary Boyce, had she died possessed thereof intestate and without having been married. The facts were as follows:—By a settlement of 26th October, 1891, made on the second marriage of Mary Boyce, she covenanted to pay the sum of £12,000 to her trustees, to be held by

them upon certain trusts for the spouses during their joint lives and the life of the survivor of them. There were the usual trusts in favour of the children of the marriage, and then it was declared that if there should be no child of the marriage who should attain the age of twenty-one years or marry under that age, which event happened, the trust premises should be held subject to a power of appointment given to the wife which was not exercised in trust if the husband survived her, which event happened, "for such person or persons as under the Statutes for the Distribution of the Effects of Intestates would have become entitled thereto on the decease of the said Mary Boyce, had she died possessed thereof intestate and without having been married." On 13th March, 1895, the wife died intestate. There were no children of the marriage. On 20th August, 1919, the husband died. The wife had had one son by a former husband whom she had divorced. By her first marriage settlement she had settled certain funds which that son had become entitled to on his coming of age in 1908. On the day that she executed her second marriage settlement she also made a voluntary settlement of a further sum in favour of that son.

SARGANT, J., after stating the facts and referring to many authorities, said:—Apart from some very distinct reason for holding the contrary, the words "without having been married" should be construed here as equivalent to "without ever having been married." *Prima facie* the words "without having been married" are more flexible than the words "without ever having been married"; but in the absence of some context or surrounding circumstances pointing to the view that the words "without having been married" mean without having entered into the marriage then contemplated, I must treat them as equivalent to "without ever having been married." I am assisted in this view by the fact that the will has made provision for the son of the first marriage, and I desire to reserve for decision on some other occasion the question of construction of these words in a marriage settlement made by a widow having children by her first marriage for whom no provision has been made.—**COUNSEL, C. W. Turner; Galbraith, K.C.; Dighton Pollock; Harman; G. G. Solomon and R. Roope Rees. SOLICITORS, Stanley & Co., for Stanley, Washbrough, Doggett & Baker, Bristol; Fizard, Oldham, Crowder & Cash; Sharpe, Pritchard & Co., for William Walker, Manchester; Murr, Rusby & Archer, for Sharpe, Darby & Millichip, West Bromwich; Field, Roscoe & Co., for Bubb & Co., Cheltenham.**

[Reported by LEONARD MAY, Barrister-at-Law.]

New Orders, &c.

The Solicitors' Remuneration Act General Order, 1920.

We, the Right Honourable Frederick Lord Birkenhead, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, the Right Honourable the Earl of Reading, Lord Chief Justice of England, the Right Honourable William Lord Stendale, Master of the Rolls, William Arthur Sharpe, Esquire, President of the Law Society, and Sir Arthur Norman Hill, President of the Incorporated Law Society of Liverpool, being the persons authorized by section 2 of the Solicitors' Remuneration Act, 1881 (in this Order called "the Act"), do hereby, by virtue of the power vested in us by the said Act and of every other power enabling us in that behalf, order and direct as follows:—

1. The remuneration of a solicitor in respect of all business regulated by clause 2 (c) of the General Order made under the Act as amended by any subsequent General Order may at the option of the solicitor be by a gross sum in lieu of by detailed charges.

Provided that within 12 months after delivery of a charge made under this Order or within one month after payment (whichever shall be the later date) the client may require that a detailed Bill of Charges shall be delivered, and the solicitor shall thereupon comply with the requisition, and any Bill so delivered shall be subject to taxation as if the provisions of this Order with respect to the regulation of remuneration by gross sum had not been made.

2. This Order may be cited as the Solicitors' Remuneration Act General Order, 1920.

28th June.

The Rules of the Supreme Court (Trinity Masters' Fees), 1920.

We, the Rule Committee of the Supreme Court, hereby make the following rules:—

The following shall be the scale of fees payable to each of the Elder Brethren of the Trinity House summoned in Admiralty Actions in the Probate, Divorce and Admiralty Division:—

1. For hearing in any action other than one in which salvage only is claimed, £6 6s. per diem.

2. For hearing in any action in which salvage only is claimed—
(1) where there is one set of pleadings, £3 3s. per diem.
(2) where there is more than one set of pleadings, £5 5s. per diem.

3. If the part hearing of an action shall on any day end before the mid-day adjournment, or shall commence after such adjournment, the Trinity Master having in the latter case been engaged in a previous case, or not having been in attendance before such

adj
par
4
or
5
con
men
F
th
deli
6
any
half
7
sha
cou
suc
8
and
be
par
9
sha
10
and
O.
sitt
11
(Tr
1st
14th J

Pursu
Commis
provisi
mentio

N
193
The r
Act, 18
a. 2).

Where
that H
as respo
to that
that suc
being a
rate of
from th
they su
the sche

G
Y
F
R
M
F
L
Dated
Inlan

By vi
1914 to
1919, an
Board of
1. Pro
Peace) I
after the
2. Int
herein u
Board of
thereby

adjournment, half the day fee shall be payable in respect of such part hearing, provided that such half-fee shall not be less than £3 3s.

4. For hearing of any appeal, whether there be a cross appeal or no, to the Divisional Court, in each case £4 4s.

5. For attending to hear judgment, when reserved, including consultation with the Judge, or Judges, on the day on which judgment is given, £3 3s.

For consultation with the Judge, or Judges, on any day other than one on which the action is heard or reserved judgment delivered, £3 3s.

6. For attendance on any day when not called upon to sit in any action half the day fee shall be payable, provided that such half-fee shall not be less than £3 3s.

7. If notice of attendance in any case shall have been given and shall, less than two days before the day of hearing, have been countermanded, half the day fee shall be payable, provided that such half-fee shall not be less than £3 3s.

8. Actions in which there are counterclaims, consolidated actions and all actions tried together shall, for the purpose of these rules, be considered single actions, the total fees being payable in equal parts in each action, unless the Judge shall otherwise order.

9. In any case not falling within these rules the fees to be paid shall be fixed by a Judge.

10. The Rules of the Supreme Court, dated 12th January, 1893, and the Rules of the Supreme Court, dated 1st July, 1913 (S.R. & O., 1913, No. 747/L. 12) (as to fees payable to the Trinity Masters sitting as Assessors in Admiralty causes), are hereby rescinded.

11. These Rules may be cited as the Rules of the Supreme Court (Trinity Masters' Fees), 1920, and shall come into operation on the 1st day of August, 1920.

Treasury Order.

COLONIAL STOCK ACT, 1900 (63 & 64 VICT. c. 62).

ADDITION TO LIST OF STOCKS UNDER SECTION 2.

Pursuant to section 2 of the Colonial Stock Act, 1900, the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury hereby give notice that the provisions of the Act have been complied with in respect of the undermentioned Stock, registered or inscribed in the United Kingdom:—

New South Wales Government 6½ per cent. Inscribed Stock, 1930-40.

The restrictions mentioned in section 2, sub-section (2), of the Trustees Act, 1893, apply to the above Stock (see Colonial Stock Act, 1900, s. 2).

Inland Revenue Order.

STAMP DUTIES.

Whereas section 12 (2) of the Finance Act, 1899, provides, *inter alia*, that His Majesty's Commissioners of Inland Revenue may substitute, as respects any foreign or colonial currency mentioned in the schedule to that Act, any rate of exchange for that specified in the schedule, and that such Act shall be construed as if any rate of exchange for the time being substituted were contained in the said schedule, and as if the rate of exchange for which the new rate is substituted were omitted from that schedule, the said Commissioners do hereby give notice that they substitute the following rates of exchange for those specified in the schedule to the Finance Act, 1899:—

Gold dollar : Four to one pound.
Yen : Eight to one pound.
Florin, guilder, guilden : Eleven to one pound.
Rupee : Ten to one pound.
Mark : One hundred and fifty to one pound.
Franc (French) : Fifty to one pound.
Franc (Swiss) : Twenty-two to one pound.
Lira : Sixty-six to one pound.

Dated this 26th day of July, 1920.

F. A. BARRETT, Secretary.

Inland Revenue, Somerset House, London.

Board of Trade Order.

PATENTS FOR INVENTIONS.

THE PATENTS (TREATY OF PEACE) RULES, 1920.

DATED 24TH JULY, 1920.

By virtue of the provisions of the Trading with the Enemy Acts, 1914 to 1918, the Treaty of Peace Act, 1919, the Treaty of Peace Order, 1919, and the Order of the Board of Trade, dated 19th July, 1920, the Board of Trade do hereby make the following Rules:—

1. *Preliminary.*—These Rules may be cited as the Patents (Treaty of Peace) Rules, 1920, and shall come into operation from and immediately after the 19th day of July, 1920.

2. *Interpretation.*—In the construction of these Rules any words herein used, the meanings of which are defined by the Order of the Board of Trade, dated the 19th day of July, 1920, shall have the meanings thereby assigned to them respectively.

APPROVED and COMMENDED by leading EXPERTS for the REMEDIAL TREATMENT of all grades of MENTAL DEFECT.

The ROYAL EARLSWOOD INSTITUTION

is a REAL HOME for those UNDEVELOPED persons of both sexes who need kind control and expert supervision in Good Schools, Farm, Kitchen Garden and Manual training.

Trust Funds are available for the Children of Barristers, Solicitors, and Clergy of Church of England.

Admission on Inclusive Fees. If whole cost cannot be paid, by votes of Subscribers, with part-payment. No competition, only a small definite number of votes required.

Legacies as Endowments create permanent benefits.

Full information of Mr. H. HOWARD, Secretary, 14-16, Ludgate Hill, London, E.C. 4. Telephone: 5297 City.

3. *Fees.*—The fees to be paid under these Rules shall be those specified in the first Schedule to these Rules.

4. *Forms.*—The forms herein referred to are the forms contained in the second Schedule to these Rules. Such forms shall be used in all cases to which they are applicable and may be modified as directed by the Comptroller to meet other cases.

5. *Voluntary Dealings in or under Restored Patents, &c.*—Where any assignment or assurance of a restored patent or of the benefit of a restored application or any licence under a restored patent has been agreed between parties, application for the consent of the Board of Trade to any such assignment, assurance, or licence shall be made on Patents Form No. 40 before the execution of the document effecting such assignment, assurance or licence. Such application shall be accompanied by a copy of the draft document proposed to be executed.

6. *Devolution of Title by Operation of Law.*—Where any person claims to be entitled to the benefit of or any interest in a restored patent or restored application by virtue of operation of law, arising after the outbreak of war, he shall make application for the consent of the Board of Trade to his title as claimed being recognised upon Patents Form No. 41. Such application shall be accompanied by a copy of the instrument or other document under which the applicant claims title.

7. *Application for Licence under Restored Patent other than under Rule 5.*—An application for the grant of a licence under a restored patent or a patent granted upon a restored application shall be made upon Patents Form No. 42. Such application shall be accompanied by an unstamped copy and a statement in duplicate setting out fully the reason for making the application, the facts upon which the applicant bases his case, and the terms of the licence which he is prepared to accept. A copy of the application and of the statement will be transmitted by the Comptroller to the patentee at his address for service on the Register of Patents.

Upon such application being made and copy thereof transmitted to the patentee, the latter, if desirous of contesting the application, shall within one month of the receipt of such copy at his address for service, or such further time as the Comptroller may allow, leave at the Patent Office a counter-statement fully setting out the grounds upon which the application is contested and, on so leaving, shall deliver to the applicant a copy thereof.

Upon receipt of such counter-statement, and/or any further evidence the Comptroller may require, the Comptroller shall proceed to determine the application.

8. *Application for Revision of Licence.*—An application for the revision of a licence, whether granted by the Board of Trade, the Custodian, or under these Rules under a restored patent, shall be made upon Patents Form No. 43. Such application shall be accompanied by an unstamped copy and a statement in duplicate setting out fully the facts upon which the applicant bases his case and the terms of such licence as he is prepared to accept or grant. A copy of the application and of the statement will be transmitted by the Comptroller to the patentee at his address for service on the Register of Patents or the Licensee concerned, as the case may be.

Upon such application being made and copy therefore transmitted, the patentee or licensee, as the case may be, if desirous of contesting the application, shall within one month of the receipt of such copy at his address for service, or such further time as the Comptroller may allow, leave at the Patent Office a counter-statement fully setting out the grounds upon which the application is contested and, on so leaving, shall deliver to the applicant a copy thereof.

Upon receipt of such counter-statement, and/or any further evidence the Comptroller may require, the Comptroller shall proceed to determine the application.

9. *Application for the Expropriation, Taking Over or Selling Any Restored Patent.*—An application for the expropriation, taking over or sale of any restored patent or a patent granted upon a restored application shall be made upon Patents Form No. 44. Such application shall be accompanied by an unstamped copy and a statement in duplicate

setting out fully the reason for making the application and the facts upon which the Applicant bases his case. A copy of the application and of the statement will be transmitted by the Comptroller to the patentee at his address for service on the Register of Patents.

Upon such application being made and copy thereof transmitted to the patentee, the latter, if desirous of contesting the application, shall, within one month of the receipt of such copy at his address for service, or such further time as the Comptroller may allow, leave at the Patent Office a counter-statement fully setting out the grounds upon which application is contested and on so leaving, shall deliver to the applicant a copy thereof.

Upon receipt of such counter-statement and/or any further evidence the Comptroller may require the Comptroller shall proceed to determine whether the application should be granted and be referred to a special tribunal for the settlement of terms.

Where it is decided to grant the application and refer it to a special tribunal for the settlement of terms application to be heard by the special tribunal shall be made upon Patents Form No. 45.

10. *Hearings.*—Before deciding any issue raised under Rules 7, 8 and 9 of these Rules, or before exercising any discretionary power given to the Comptroller under the Order of the Board of Trade, dated 19th July, 1920, or these Rules, adversely to any party, the Comptroller shall give ten days' notice, or such longer notice as he may think fit, to the party or parties as the case may be, of the time when he is prepared to hear such party or parties or their representatives.

11. *Evidence.*—In lieu of or in addition to any oral evidence that may be given at a hearing the Comptroller may require any party to file evidence by way of statutory declaration, and allow any declarant to be cross-examined on his declaration.

12. *Costs.*—The Comptroller may award costs in any proceedings under these Rules, and direct how and by what parties they are to be paid. Further, in any case in which he thinks fit, the Comptroller may require any person initiating proceedings to give security for costs, and in the event of such security not being forthcoming, may dismiss the application in question.

24th July.

FIRST SCHEDULE

[Fees.]

SECOND SCHEDULE

[Forms.]

[Gazette, 30th July.]

Ministry of Munitions Order.

THE FLAX CONTROL (CANCELLATION) ORDER, 1920.

1. The Orders indicated in the Schedule hereto annexed are hereby cancelled, as from the 31st day of August, 1920.

2. Nothing in this Order shall affect the operation of the said Orders previous to the 31st day of August, 1920, or the validity of any action taken, or to be taken, thereunder, or any liability to any penalty or punishment in respect of any contravention or failure to comply with the said Orders prior to such cancellation, or any proceedings or remedy in respect of such penalty or punishment.

3. This Order may be cited as the Flax Control (Cancellation) Order, 1920.

SCHEDULE.

Flax (Irish Crop) Order, 1917.
Spun (Flax) Yarn Order, 1917.
Flax (Irish Crop) Order, 1918.
Rescued Tow Order, 1918.
Rescued Tow No. 2 Order, 1918.
Flax (Irish Crop) Order, 1919.
Flax (Irish Crop) Amendment No. 2 Order, 1919.

27th July.

Ministry of Food Orders.

NOTICE OF REVOCATION OF CERTAIN ORDERS RELATING TO DRIED FRUITS.

In exercise of the powers conferred upon him by the Defence of the Realm Regulations and of all other powers enabling him in that behalf, the Food Controller hereby revokes as on the 2nd August, 1920, the Orders specified in the Schedule hereto, but without prejudice to any proceedings in respect of any contravention thereof.

9th July.

[Gazette, 3rd August.]

THE SCHEDULE.

S.R. & O.
No. 761 of 1918, No. 1518 of 1919, The Dried Fruits (Retail Prices) Order, 1918.
and No. 7 of 1920.
No. 1002 of 1919. The Dried Fruits (Restriction) Order, 1919.
No. 1540 of 1919. The Dried Fruits (Wholesale Prices) Order, 1919.

The following Ministry of Food Orders have also been issued:—

The Meat (Maximum Prices) Order, 1920. Notice, 19th July.
Order amending the Cereals (Restriction) Order, 1919. 9th July.

ATHERTONS

LIMITED,

63 & 64, Chancery Lane, LONDON, W.C.

THE ONLY RECOGNISED LAW PARTNERSHIP,
SUCCESSION, AND AMALGAMATION AGENTS
WHO HAVE ARRANGED PERSONALLY MOST
OF THE IMPORTANT CHANGES IN LEGAL
PRACTICES FOR YEARS PAST.

Correspondence and Consultations invited in strict confidence.
Telephone: 3422 Holborn. Telegrams: "Athertons, London."

ATHERTONS

LIMITED

63 & 64, Chancery Lane, LONDON, W.C.

Commissions and Committees.

ANCIENT MONUMENTS INQUIRY.

Sir Alfred Mond, Commissioner of Works, appointed an Advisory Committee, consisting of Lord Beauchamp (chairman), Lord Ferrers, Sir Martin Conway, M.P., Lieutenant-Colonel the Hon. C. James, M.P., Bishop Browne, Sir Hercules Read, Sir Lionel Earle, and Mr. Peers (the Chief Inspector of Ancient Monuments), with the following terms of reference:—

1. To advise on the question of amending and strengthening the existing Ancient Monuments Act.
2. To consider whether the powers conferred by Parliament should be widened so as to include advisory powers over ecclesiastical and secular buildings which are still in occupation.

ADOPTION OF CHILDREN.

The Home Secretary has appointed a Departmental Committee to consider (1) whether it is desirable to make legal provision for the adoption of children in this country, and (2) if so, what form such provision should take.

The Committee consists of Sir Alfred Hopkinson, K.C. (chairman), Mr. Neville Chamberlain, M.P., the Hon. Lady Norman, C.B.E., Mrs. C. E. B. Russell, Mr. James Seddon, C.H., M.P., and Mr. F. W. Sherwood. The secretary is Mr. G. R. Sharpe, of the Home Office, to whom all communications should be addressed.

PROTECTION OF WILD BIRDS.

The Home Secretary has appointed an Advisory Committee to advise the Home Office on matters connected with the administration of the Wild Birds Protection Acts. The Committee consists of the Duke of Rutland (chairman), Mr. E. C. Stuart Baker, F.Z.S., secretary of the British Ornithologists' Union; Dr. Percy H. Lowe, of the Natural History Museum; Mr. H. G. Maurice, of the Ministry of Agriculture; and Mr. Montagu Sharpe, chairman of the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds.

Societies.

The National Federation of Law Clerks.

RECOMMENDATION OF LAW CLERKS JOINT CONCILIATION BOARD (LONDON).

At a meeting of the London Joint Conciliation Board, held on Wednesday, the 26th July, 1920, at the Law Society, it was resolved to recommend to the profession that, in view of the present high cost of living estimated by the Ministry of Labour now 152 per cent., and pending the full consideration of the clerks' claim for increased remuneration, an immediate all-round adequate increase on pre-war salaries is desirable in cases where such adequate increase of salaries has not already been made.

It was further resolved that this recommendation should be communicated by the Secretary to the London members of the Law Society and that the Clerks' Panel be at liberty to communicate it to their members and to the legal and general Press.

The Law Society.

THE REPORT OF THE COUNCIL.

(Continued from page 690.)

Unemployment Insurance Bill.—This Bill will affect solicitors' clerks, and the Council were asked by the United Law Clerks' Society to consider the desirability of co-operating in the formation of an Association of Employers and Employed through which clerks should be able to

insure the rate than that it m to reduce shewed the person w doubt exi ably. I adjourned intentions

Solicitor steps in t the Solic under the of profess off the Ro movement a report

In futu and finally be subject of the app

The new had made on this oc and also of expre indebted a valuable c

The Dis hearing obtained th The Ma form and made and concurred

Poor Pe Chairmans Chancellor the Poor l Two impo exercised means, and (6) that co The comm and that w should be a are willing assistance of an offica would obvi the setting Court. Mr strongly ur matrimonial the present gestion wer mittee of th consideration been issued. Mr. Coley a

Proceedin this report and their n Roll by the of the Solic and other c given. As 1888, the Co the ground c where applic on payment

Prize

The Presid dealing with it would be p for sittings v sittings was further sittin arrangements

Prize

The Presid dealing with it would be p for sittings v sittings was further sittin arrangements

Mr. James formerly of E

insure themselves. Unemployment amongst clerks being at a lower rate than amongst the community as a whole, it was at first thought that it might be possible by means of a separate association materially to reduce the insurance contributions. Careful consideration, however, showed that a saving to employers of a halfpenny a week per insured person was the utmost that could be anticipated, and even then grave doubt existed as to whether the association could be carried on profitably. In the circumstances, the consideration of the suggestion was adjourned until it becomes possible to ascertain more definitely the intentions of the Government with regard to the Bill.

Solicitors Act, 1919.—During the past year one of the most important steps in the history of the profession has been taken by the passing of the Solicitors Act, 1919, which empowers the Statutory Committee under the Solicitors Act, 1888, not merely to hear and report upon cases of professional misconduct, but also to make orders striking solicitors off the Rolls, or suspending them from practice such as before the commencement of the Act, the court would have had power to make upon a report of the committee.

In future, therefore, cases of professional misconduct will be heard and finally disposed of by the committee, whose decision, however, will be subject to an appeal to the Divisional Court at the instance either of the applicant or of the solicitor.

The new Act had been in draft for a number of years, and the Council had made many previous efforts to get it passed. They were fortunate on this occasion to secure the Lord Chancellor's approval of the Bill, and also that of the Attorney-General. They take this opportunity of expressing their thanks for the assistance so derived, and they are indebted also to their colleague Sir Donald Maclean, M.P., for his very valuable co-operation.

The Discipline Committee have issued rules for regulating the making, hearing and determining of applications under the new Act, and have obtained the assent of the Master of the Rolls to them.

The Master of the Rolls also has made rules prescribing the time, form and manner within and in which appeals to the court are to be made and heard, and the Lord Chancellor and Lord Chief Justice have concurred in such rules.

Poor Persons' Procedure.—The Departmental Committee, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Justice P. O. Lawrence, appointed by the Lord Chancellor to consider and report upon the question of procedure under the Poor Persons' Rules, issued their report in January of this year. Two important recommendations are (a) that greater care should be exercised in ascertaining that applicants have not understated their means, and that there should be an income as well as a capital test, and (b) that conducting solicitors should not be allowed "office expenses." The committee recommended also that new rules should be framed, and that when such rules have been issued the various law societies should be asked to assist in the preparation of panels of solicitors who are willing to report upon or to act in poor persons' cases. If such assistance is not forthcoming, the alternative would be the setting up of an official department to carry out the rules in divorce cases, and this would obviously be a very dangerous precedent and might result in the setting up of a similar department in all branches of the High Court. Mr. Coley and Mr. Goddard, in a memorandum to the report, strongly urged the desirability of conferring jurisdiction in divorce and matrimonial cases on the county courts, and expressed the opinion that the present congestion in such cases would largely disappear if this suggestion were adopted. The report has been referred to a special committee of the Council appointed for the purpose, who will give careful consideration to its recommendations as soon as the new rules have been issued. In the meantime the Council passed a resolution thanking Mr. Coley and Mr. Goddard for their labours on the committee.

Proceedings under the Solicitors Acts.—During the year covered by this report six solicitors were convicted of various indictable offences, and their names were, on the application of the Society, struck off the Roll by the order of the Divisional Court. Convictions under section 12 of the Solicitors Act, 1874, were obtained against six unqualified persons, and other cases have been withdrawn after inquiry and apology being given. As regards applications under section 16 of the Solicitors Act, 1888, the Council refused to renew the certificates of five solicitors on the ground of bankruptcy or other circumstances, and in five other cases where applicants admitted having practised, the certificate was issued on payment of the arrears of duty and in some cases a fine.

Prize Court Work in the Long Vacation.

The President announced in court last Saturday the arrangements for dealing with Prize Court cases during the Long Vacation. He said that it would be practicable for parties to set down causes for hearing in prize for sittings which would begin on 21st September. When that series of sittings was fully supplied, causes could be set down for hearing at further sittings, which would begin on 28th September. After that arrangements would be made as business required.

Mr. James Robert Harries-Jones, of Clegg-street, Oldham, Lancashire, formerly of Harrogate, solicitor, left estate of gross value, £18,505.

The Business of the King's Bench Division during the Vacation.

The Lord Chief Justice, on taking his seat in the Court of Criminal Appeal on 30th July, said: Before we separate to-day, after hearing the Criminal Court appeals, I want to draw attention to the arrangements that have been made in this Division for the hearing of cases during the Vacation. There are rules already made, to which effect will be given, whereby applications can be made at any time after 26th July for the hearing of any cause or matter thought to be in urgent need of trial, and then the judge, if satisfied, can make provision that the case shall be tried during the Vacation. I want to say, further, that should it be necessary to hold a Divisional Court, instead of—as the rule now stands during the Vacation—one judge's having the jurisdiction, two judges in the Divisional Court may well be given. There will be sittings of the Court of Criminal Appeal during the Vacation, in order that all criminal appeals may be disposed of within a proper and reasonable time and without delay. All matters that require urgent trial can, therefore, be dealt with during the Vacation, and especially such cases as come under Order XIV. can be disposed of under the rule if there is urgent need for trial during the Vacation. I make these observations that it may be more widely known than at present that we hope in the King's Bench Division, by arrangement, to make provision for the hearing of any urgent case during the Vacation. That applies to everything except juries, and the only reason why we do not make it apply to jury actions is because of the difficulty of summoning juries during the Vacation. So far as one can tell there is no need, and there has certainly been no demand, for the hearing of jury actions during the Vacation.

With regard to the list, I would further draw attention to this: that the cases we are now trying are all cases which have been set down for trial since the end of April. From that time until the present all cases set down for trial before that date have been disposed of except those, by arrangement between the parties, which have been postponed. I make these remarks so that not only the Bar, but also the public, may know that, where there is need for the trial of an action, I can make arrangements, with the assent of my brother judges, to provide judges for the trial.

Mr. Justice Horridge, who was sitting to hear undefended divorce cases last Saturday, the last day of the legal term, on that day completed his tenth year of duty on the judicial bench. During the whole of that period he has not been absent for a single day through illness.

W. WHITELEY, LTD.

AUCTIONEERS,
EXPERT VALUERS AND ESTATE AGENTS,

QUEEN'S ROAD, LONDON, W. 2.

VALUATIONS FOR PROBATE,

ESTATE DUTY, SALE, FIRE INSURANCE, ETC.

AUCTION SALES EVERY THURSDAY,
VIEW ON WEDNESDAY,

IN

LONDON'S LARGEST SALEROOM.

PHONE NO.: PARK ONE (40 LINES). TELEGRAMS: "WHITELEY LONDON."

Law Students' Journal.

The Law Society.

LECTURES AND CLASSES.

Solicitors and articulated clerks are entitled to attend the lectures and classes on payment of the prescribed fees. Other students may be admitted, if space permits, at the discretion of the Council.

By an Order dated 16th June, 1913, made by the Master of the Rolls (with the concurrence of the Lord Chancellor and the Lord Chief Justice), under section 13 of the Solicitors Act, 1877, students who have, before entering into articles, attended for one year the curriculum approved by the Council, and have passed an examination therein to the satisfaction of the Council, may be admitted as solicitors after four years' service under articles.

The prospectus and time-table of the Society's lectures and classes (oral and correspondence) for the third term, 1920 (commencing 13th September and ending 28th October), has been issued.

All lectures and classes will be held at the Law Society's Hall, Chancery-lane, W.C. 2.

The principal will be in his room at the Society's Hall on Monday and Tuesday, 13th and 14th September, from 10.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m., and from 2.30 p.m. to 4.30 p.m., for the purpose of seeing students who desire to enter for the lectures or classes of the term. It is particularly requested that all such students will make a point of calling during the above hours, or, if they are unable to call, will write to the principal, giving full particulars of their requirements.

The principal will also be in his room every Tuesday and Friday during term, from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m., for the purpose of being consulted by students.

TERMS.

The teaching year consists of four terms of about eight weeks each, arranged to fit in with the Society's examinations. Students can enter at the commencement of any term, but must take the subjects in the order provided.

THE FINAL EXAMINATION.

A complete set of lectures and classes (oral and written) will be provided every four terms in all the subjects of this examination; but students are strongly recommended to spread their attendance over a longer period (the fee being the same in each case), by taking only one or two subjects a term.

(Students may begin their courses at the commencement of any term.)

THE INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATION.

A complete set of lectures and classes (oral and written) will be provided every two terms in all the subjects of this examination; but students are strongly recommended to spread their attendance over a longer period (the fee being the same in each case), by taking only one or two subjects a term.

(Students may begin their courses at the commencement of any term.)

CLASS WORK.

In all the more important subjects, each lecture is supplemented by a class for informal discussion and individual tuition. Students are encouraged to ask questions on the lecture, and to bring forward any difficulties which they may have encountered in their own reading.

REVISION CLASSES.

These classes are intended to be taken shortly before their final examination by students who have previously taken the ordinary courses in the same subjects. Permission to join them must be obtained from the principal. Students who have obtained certificates of distinction (see below) will be excused payment of fees for revision classes in the same subjects.

STUDENTSHIPS.

Two studentships of the annual value of £40 each were awarded by the Council in July last.

CERTIFICATES OF DISTINCTION.

Certificates of distinction are awarded on the combined results of the term's work (including attendance at lectures and classes) and the voluntary test examinations (see below).

LIBRARY FACILITIES.

Students attending the lectures and classes of the Society have, by special permission of the Council, the privilege of using the Society's West Library for reference purposes, without payment, on production of their tickets of admission to the students' rooms (see below).

Arrangements have been made with Messrs. Butterworth & Co., of Bell-yard, W.C., for the maintenance of a lending library for the use of the Society's students. Terms on application at the Society's office, or to Messrs. Butterworth & Co.

TERMINAL EXAMINATIONS.

A voluntary test examination is held at the end of each course, open to all students who have attended that course. No results are published; but each candidate's answers are returned to him, marked and fully annotated. Correspondence students can work these papers either at home or at the Society's hall.

STUDENTS' ROOMS.

The students' rooms, consisting of luncheon room, common room, and smoking room, are open, without subscription, to articulated clerks attending the lectures and classes of the Society, and to students qualifying under the exemption order. Tickets of admission can be obtained in the office, and members can also obtain copies of the rules.

BULLETIN OF RECENT CHANGES IN THE LAW.

This is a brief summary of important recent statutes and decisions, which is sent quarterly (free of charge) to every student who has been in attendance during the preceding year. The student is thus kept in touch with recent changes.

* These terms are, approximately, September-October, November-December, mid-January-March, and mid-April-June, respectively, in each year.

Legal News.

Appointments.

Mr. EDWARD ST. JOHN JACKSON, O.B.E. (Attorney-General), has been appointed to be Judge of His Majesty's High Court of Nyasaland.

Mr. JOSEPH ALFRED SHERIDAN (Magistrate) has been appointed to be a Judge of His Majesty's High Court of East Africa.

Sir ARCHIBALD HENRY BODKIN has been appointed to be Director of Public Prosecutions in the place of Sir Charles W. Mathews, Bart., K.C.B., deceased. Sir Archibald Bodkin, who was born in 1862, was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple in 1885, and has been Senior Prosecuting Counsel to the Treasury since 1908.

Mr. EDGAR STANFORD-LONDON, C.B.E., has been appointed to be Chief Inspector of Stamps and Taxes, in succession to Sir Thomas Collins, who has retired from the public service. Mr. London has held the post of Deputy Chief Inspector.

General.

Probate has been granted in London of the will of Mr. Joseph Hodge Choate, of New York, formerly American Ambassador in London, whose property in the United Kingdom is valued at £380. The total value of his estate, as reported from New York, is £945,000. He left \$60,000 (about £16,000) to various American charities.

After a case had been settled at Birmingham County Court last week, the parties to it quarrelled in the corridor of the court, and a fierce fight took place, in which men, women and children took part. Some of the women had their hair pulled down and clothing torn. Having been driven into the street by the combined efforts of counsel, solicitors, clerks and court officials, the disputants attempted to renew the struggle in the street, but were separated by the police.

Mr. William Donaldson Rawlin, K.C., of White Waltham Grove, White Waltham, Berks, a bencher of Lincoln's Inn, a writer of a number of law books, and co-editor with the late Sir Edward Fry of the recognized text-book on "Specific Performance," left estate of gross value, £44,439.

Occasional prosecutions, says the *Times*, are a reminder that certain orders of the Ministry of Food are still operative. A Lincolnshire woman was recently fined under the Waste of Foodstuffs Order, for permitting a quantity of bread to become mouldy. A Cambridgeshire firm of millers was ordered to pay fines and costs amounting to £314 for a transgression of the Cereals Restriction Order, which prohibits the use of wheat for other purposes than for seed or for the manufacture of flour, except under a certificate from two members of a panel. It was stated that a quantity of wheat suitable for the manufacture of flour was milled into food for cattle.

Winding-up Notices.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, July 30.

OXFORD-ST. LAND INVESTMENT CO., LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 8, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thos. F. Hobson, Fountaine-st., Temple, Liquidator.

BRITISH AMBULANCE COMMITTEE, SERVICE DE SANTE MILITAIRE.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 14, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Francis William Paisley, 28, Coleman-st., Liquidator.

CUMBERLAND EVENING MAIL PUBLISHING CO., LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 4, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to E. J. Williams, Exchange-bldgs., 14, Lowther-st., Carlisle, Liquidator.

PILOT SPINNING CO., LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 16, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts and claims, to John Lewis Merchant, Liquidator, under cover to the Pilot Spinning Co., Ltd., Savings Bank-bldgs., Bury.

WILLIAM ASQUITH (1919), LTD. (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION FOR RECONSTRUCTION).—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Arthur Stocks, Commercial Bank-chmbrs., Tyrril-st., Bradford, Liquidator.

HICKFORTH, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Aug. 14, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to James Pullen, Southwell, 15/19, Ironmonger-lane, Liquidator.

WILKIN, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Alfred Octavius Hedley, 40, West Sunnyside, Sunderland, Liquidator.

GREAT MARLOW PICTURE PALACE CO., LTD. (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Aug. 28, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Fredk. Maddox (Maddox, Savage, Petter & Co.), 28, Budge-row, Cannon-st., Liquidator.

LONDON ACADEMY OF BILLIARDS, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 3, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to F. H. Perrott, 4, Southampton-row, Liquidator.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Aug. 3.

PARK PLACE SPINNING CO., LTD. (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Aug. 28, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Gilbert Atack, 29, Cecil-rd., Eccles, Liquidator.

PERDUTON RADIATOR CO., LTD. (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thomas Bosack Weir, 36, Spring-gdns., Manchester, Liquidator.

CARDIFF PROPERTY TRUST, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Aug. 9, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Isaac Watkins, 22, Castle Arcade-balcony, Cardiff, Liquidator.

BOLTHOOD MILL CO., LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct. 4, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts and claims, to Arthur Ormroyd, liquidator, c/o said company, 233, Copster Hill-rd., Oldham.

YORKSHIRE FISHING AND DIRECT SUPPLY CO. (SCARBOROUGH), LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 10, to send in their names and addresses, with particulars of their debts or claims, to Alfred Isaac Cook Forster, 7, Stonegate, York, Liquidator.

MARINISSEN, MILLER & CO., LTD. (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 6, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr. John Worsley, of Messrs. Cooper & Cooper, 60, and 62, Spring-gdns., Manchester, Liquidator.

BEVY (NIXON'S) GOLD MINES, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct. 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to F. D. Norwood, New Broad-st. House, Liquidator.

SENLIGHT LAUNDRY (ASHTON), LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 3, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts and claims, to Fred Goulding Schofield, liquidator of the said Company, 16, Clegg-st., Oldham.

Resolutions for Winding-up Voluntarily.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, July 23.

Nigerian Hydraulic Tin Mines, Ltd.
Woolston Estates Co., Ltd.
Button, Sutton & Co., Ltd.
W. L. Kirby, Ltd.
James Fison & Sons, Ltd.
Fearnth Brick Works Co., Ltd.
British Dredging Co., Ltd.
Hall's Asbestos Eastern Agency, Ltd.
Walsall Advertiser Co., Ltd.
E. J. Heading & Co., Ltd.
Robson Cream Metal Polish Co., Ltd.

Heard Brothers, Ltd.
Brasseur & Arnott, Ltd.
Hygeia Sanitary Laundry Co., Ltd.
John Swales & Sons, Ltd.
Regent Picture House (Tipton), Ltd.
Caton Engineering Co., Ltd.
Allied Industries, Ltd.
Langensur Hippodrome and Entertainments, Ltd.
McGaw & Co., Ltd.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, July 27.

J. H. Cooper, Ltd. (Ilkley).
Highlands Syndicate, Ltd.
Graham-King Advertising Co., Ltd.
Joshua Besant & Co., Ltd.
Vator Oilskin Manufacturing Co., Ltd.
William Aynsley, Ltd.
Wylwyn Agencies, Ltd.
J. T. Underwood, Ltd.
North London Engineering Co., Ltd.
Guleman & Wright, Ltd.
W. P. Griffin, Ltd.
James Gibbon & Sons, Ltd.

Gaiety Amusement Hall Co., Ltd.
West Pier Steam Trawling Co., Ltd.
Ramleh Land Co., Ltd.
Juvenile Outfitters, Ltd.
Papeterie De Stamboul, Ltd.
Great Marlow Picture Palace Co., Ltd.
Ratocyn (Galicia) Oil Co., Ltd.
Pearson's Electric Miners' Lamp Co., Ltd.
New Elmwood Mills Co., Ltd.
F. W. Rowley & Co., Ltd.
Hornung & Co., Ltd.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, July 30.

Ensignan Co., Ltd.
Pilot Spinning Co., Ltd.
B.M.N. Syndicate, Ltd.
Frank Osborn, Ltd.
Gurich Film Co., Ltd.
Smith Phoenix Tin Mine, Ltd.
Stancliffe Brothers, Ltd.
C. Heckford, Ltd.
Philharmonic Hall, Ltd.
Costa Rica Coffee Estates, Ltd.
Middleton & Co. (Shanghai), Ltd.
Joseph Armsfield & Son, Ltd.
John Taylor & Sons, Ltd.
Frank H. Park, Ltd.
Bampton and District Conservative and Unionist Club Co., Ltd.

Cardiff Property Trust, Ltd.
Wandoo Syndicate, Ltd.
Kerals Rubber Co., Ltd.
Basic Phosphate Co., Ltd.
Universal Grinding Wheel Co., Ltd.
Calicut Estate Syndicate, Ltd.
White Motors & Accessories, Ltd.
Odams Nitrophosphate and Chemical Co., Ltd.
Vigo Motor Trading Corporation, Ltd.
Welsh Publishing Co., Ltd.
Elsom & Co., Ltd.
John Morris of Radcliffe, Ltd.
Charles Massey & Son, Ltd.
Mudros Syndicate, Ltd.
Sir Henry Lewis, Ltd.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Aug. 3.

Wylrold Mill Co., Ltd.
Johore Rubber Lands (1913), Ltd.
J. Gooderham & Co., Ltd.
Park Place Spinning Co., Ltd.
Walton-on-Thames Cinema Co., Ltd.
Leicester Coffee and Cocoa House Co., Ltd.
Leckhill Commercial Development Co., Ltd.
Tyneside Toys, Ltd.
B. Rosegood & Co., Ltd.
Washbrook Valley Agricultural Training Association, Ltd.
Mines and Lands Agency, Ltd.
Jules Poirat, Ltd.
Mid-Cheshire Golf Club, Ltd.
Labrum Co., Ltd.

Wilberforce Temperance Hotel (Bournemouth), Ltd.
Temiskaming (Ontario) Development Syndicate, Ltd.
Model Bakery, Ltd.
Driver Automatic Weigher, Ltd.
Brown's Motor Haulage Co., Ltd.
Hampstead Radiator and Motor Co., Ltd.
Meggitts (1917), Ltd.
M.C.O. Syndicate, Ltd.
Sheppards Stores, Ltd.
Yorkshire Fishing and Direct Supply Co. (Scarborough), Ltd.
Barraclough Brothers, Ltd.
Sharlow Vale Laundry, Ltd.

Creditors' Notices. Under Estates in Chancery.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, July 30.

FANSHAWE, ROBERT PERCIVAL, 19, Market-sq., Aylesbury, Chemist. Sept. 8. F. S. Cleaver & Sons (Ltd.) v. Annie Fanshawe. Peterson, J. R. J. Clark, 4, George-st., Croydon.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Aug. 3.

BERTIE, Rt. Hon. MONTAGU CHARLES FRANCIS, York-ter., Regent's Park. Sept. 6. Durr v. Bertie, Vacation Judge. Arthur Croxall Whitehead, 6, Bolton-st., Piccadilly.

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, July 23.

AMBROSE, ANNIE, Wyde Green, Warwick. Aug. 30. Shorthouse, Bowen & Co., Birmingham.

ARCHER, THOMAS, Heaton Mersey, Lancs., Confectionery Agent. Sept. 7. Robert Scholes & Co., Manchester.

ARMOUR, STANLEY ROBERT, Percy, Northumberland, Ontario, Canada, Doctor. Aug. 13. Downson & Sankey, 18, Adam-st., Adelphi.

ARUNDEL, JOHN THOMAS, Bournemouth. Aug. 23. G. F. Hudson, Matthews & Co., 32, Queen Victoria-st.

BAKER, GEORGE FREDERICK, Blair-st., Poplar, Ships Steward. Aug. 26. Chas. G. Bradshaw & Waterson, 85, East India Dock-rd., Poplar.

BAIDEN, SARAH, Edgbaston, Birmingham. Aug. 23. Arthur V. Blakemore, Birmingham.

BURTON, SARAH STEUDEN BEULAN, Branksome Park, Dorset. Aug. 31. Preston & Francis, Bournemouth.

CAMPBELL, ELIZABETH, Bowdness-on-Windermere. Sept. 10. Milne, Moser & Sons, Kendal.

CHADWICK, SPENCER DYSON, Great Marlborough-st. Aug. 23. Wilson, Lambert & Midgley, 30, Bedford-row.

COLLEY, ALFRED LUKE and ELIZA COLLEY, Hereford. Aug. 24. Harold Easton, Leominster.

COOPER, ALFRED, Whitechurch, Salop, Auctioneer. Aug. 16. A. E. C. Roberts, Shrewsbury.

CRACKNELL, GEORGE PEPPER, Mornington-rd., Regent's Park. Aug. 31. Bell, Brod- rick & Gtvy, 63, Queen Victoria-st.

DOBBS, WILLIAM FRANCIS, Sparkhill, Birmingham. Aug. 14. Burton & Clark, Birmingham.

DYKE, GEORGE, Southgate-rd., Islington, Licensed Victualler. Aug. 31. Syrett & Sons, 45, Finsbury-pavement.

FARMER, JOHN HENRY, Hovingham, Notts. Aug. 31. Wells & Hind, Fletcher Gate, Notts.

FUNGE, EMMA HARRIET, Upper Basildon, Berks. Aug. 30. Huntley, Son & Phillips, 92, Tooley-st.

GILES, JOHN, Portbury, Somerset, Farmer. Sept. 1. Wade, King & Co., Bristol.

HAWORTH, RICHARD, Bacup, Lancs. Aug. 7. Whitaker, Hibbert & Evans, Bacup.

THE HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN, GREAT ORMOND STREET, LONDON, W.C. 1.

ENGLAND'S GREATEST ASSET IS HER CHILDREN.

THE need for greater effort to counterbalance the drain of War upon the manhood of the Nation, by saving infant life for the future welfare of the British Empire, compels the Committee of The Hospital for Sick Children, Great Ormond Street, London, W.C. 1, to plead most earnestly for increased support for the National work this Hospital is performing in the preservation of child life.

The children of the Nation can truthfully be said to be the greatest asset the Kingdom possesses, yet the mortality among babies is still appalling, while the birthrate is slowly but surely declining.

FOR over 60 years this Hospital has been the means of saving or restoring the lives and health of hundreds of thousands of Children, and of instructing Mothers in the knowledge of looking after their children.

£15,000 has to be raised immediately to keep the Hospital out of debt.

Forms of Gift by Will to this Hospital can be obtained on application to—

JAMES MCKAY, Acting Secretary.

HEANEY, JOHN WILLIAM, Preston, Fruitw. Aug. 30. C. Fred Gardner, Lancaster.
 HORNER, CHARLES, Bishley, Leeds, Stone Merchant. Aug. 24. Lucas, Whitaker & Co., Leeds.
 HUNT, JEREMY LOUIS, Bournemouth. Aug. 31. Preston & Francis, Bournemouth.
 JACOB, Right Reverend EDGAR, St. Cross, Winchester. Aug. 26. Day & Son, 35, Great Smith-st.
 JOHNSON, NINA MARION DOWNER, Sidbury, Sidmouth. Aug. 27. Gould & Stephens, Exeter.
 JONES, ALFRED STOWELL, Finchampstead, Berks. Sept. 1. Wilde, Moore, Wigton & Sept. 21, College-hill.
 KYSER, JAMES WILLIAM NORTON, North Southern, Hants, Barrister-at-Law. Sept. 7. Arthur S. Joseph, 61, Fore-st. W. Moorgate-st.
 LAVENDER, SARAH SOPHIA, Hagley, Worcester. Aug. 26. Wyndham, Hinds & Son, Stourbridge.
 MACKBELL, HARRIET, Halifax. Aug. 21. Lewis I. Dey, Halifax.
 MACGIBBIN, JAMES THOMAS, Liverpool. Sept. 6. McKenna & Fishwick, Liverpool.
 MCGILCHRIST, CHARLES ROBERT BAYDEN, Wallasey, Chester, Merchant. Aug. 31. Avison, Morton, Paxton & Co., Liverpool.
 MITCHELL, ELIZA, Church End, Finchley. Aug. 23. Whitelock & Storr, 8, Bloomsbury-sq.
 MUNDAY, ELIZABETH, Devizes. Aug. 23. Norris & Hancock, Devizes, Wilts.
 PARKER, CHARLES HANDBACE, St. Dunstan's-hill. Aug. 14. Walters & Co., 101, Leadenhall-st.
 PARFELD, JOSEPH ALEXANDER, Woking, Surrey. Aug. 26. Robert Mossop, 17, Water-ls. Great Tower-st.
 PANTON, THOMAS JOHN, Bournemouth, Builder. Aug. 31. Preston & Francis, Bournemouth.
 PATTY, THOMAS ROBERTS, Liverpool. Aug. 28. J. F. Read & Brown, Liverpool.
 PHILLIPS, ALBERT, Birmingham. Aug. 29. Rowlands & Co., Birmingham.
 PHILLIPS, FRANCES, Stourbridge. Aug. 26. Wyndham, Hinds & Son, Stourbridge.
 POWER, EMMA, Ashley-gdms. Sept. 6. Baxter & Co., 12, Victoria-st.
 POWER, MART, Gatheshead. Aug. 31. Patrick, Bennett & Maddison, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
 RAY, HAROLD, Slough. Aug. 31. Hobson & MacMahon, 34, Essex-st., Strand.
 RUFEN, BARNEY, Leeds, Fancy Draper. Aug. 23. Fredk. Blackston, Leeds.
 SETH-SMITH, CATHERINE SARAH, Caterham Valley, Surrey. Aug. 24. Stephens & Urnston, Maidstone.
 SHARP, JAMES, Maidstone. Sept. 10. Ellis & Ellis, Maidstone.
 SMITH, FRANCES ANNE PRIZE HALL, Ely, Cambridge. Aug. 31. C. Urquhart Fisher & Co., Holborn-viaduct.
 STONE, EDWARD HERBERT, Bristol. Aug. 31. Wensbroughs, Robinson, Taylor & Taylor, Bristol.
 STUTFIELD, EMILY ANN, Hampton. Aug. 26. Barrow, Morgan & Co., Richmond, Surrey.
 TAYLOR, HOWARD ROLLINS, Walsall, Leather Goods Manufacturer. Aug. 23. James F. Addison & Cooper, Walsall.
 THOMPSON, SARAH LIDDELL, Sunderland. Aug. 10. John G. Marshall, Sunderland.
 TOWLER, EDWIN, Huntsville, Somerset. Aug. 26. F. W. Bishop & Tyrrell, Bridgewater.
 WHELAN, FREDERICK EDWARD HEDWORTH, Kingston-on-Thames. Aug. 30. Godfrey & Godfrey, 4/5, West Smithfield.
 WILSON, HARRIET, Enfield. Aug. 31. Weld & Bevan, Enfield.
 WILSON, LOUISA, Highbury. Aug. 26. Wilson, Lambert & Midgley, 30, Bedford-row.
 WINBERT, ALICE, Tredegar. Sept. 1. McKenna & Fishwick, Liverpool.
 WOMERSLEY, JOHN, Thorpe, Norwich. Aug. 21. Stevens, Miller & Jones, Norwich.

London Gazette.—Tuesday, July 27.

ALSTON, MARY, FitzJames-av., West Kensington. Aug. 24. Hannay & Hannay, South Shields.
 BARLOW, ANNE COOKE, Leicester. Aug. 31. Harris, Watts & Bouskell, Leicester.
 BLACKBURN, HAROLD, Brighouse, Yorks. Oct. 1. Barber & Jessop, Brighouse.
 BRUCE, STANLEY MALCOLM, Folkestone. Aug. 24. Downson & Sankey, 18, Adam-st., Adelphi.
 BURN, SAMUEL, Arnold, Notts., Hosiery Manager. Sept. 1. Clifton, Woodward & Smith, Nottingham.
 BYWATER, CHARLES, Huntingdon, Antique Dealer. Aug. 26. Hunnybun & Sons, Huntingdon.
 CHAVEY, LOUISA MARIA, Edgbaston, Birmingham. Sept. 1. Saunders, Bradbury & Breakwell, Birmingham.
 DEWBURY, WILLIAM, Rusholme, Manchester, Superintendent of School Attendance Officers. Aug. 31. Phyllis & Bland, Manchester.
 DOBSON, THOMAS OTTO, Warwick. Aug. 2. S. J. Grey & Wilcox, Birmingham.
 DUCKIN, LOUIS FRANCIS, Conduit-st., Regent-st., Hosiery. Aug. 27. S. Gissing Skipton, 1, Lincoln's Inn-fields.
 DUNHAM, HENRY, Preston, Coal Dealer. Aug. 31. Forshaw, Parker & Co., Preston.
 EDMONDSON, THOMAS WILLIAM, Leeds, Merchant. Sept. 10. Herbert Denison, Leeds.
 FOSTER, JOHN PORTER, Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Sept. 1. Hatchett, Jones, Bisgood, Marshall & Thomas, 48, Mark-ls.
 FOWLER, MARY ANN, Priory-rd., Hampstead. Sept. 1. Speechly, Mumford & Craig, 10, New-sq., Lincoln's Inn.
 GEORGE, REGINA, Barnstable. Aug. 31. Brewer & Son, Barnstable.
 GOODIER, ARTHUR, Smarlee, Kent. Sept. 1. Stones, Morris & Stone, 41, Moorgate-st.
 HAMMOND, PEREGRINE, Redland, Bristol. Sept. 10. Benson, Carpenter, Cross & Williams, Bristol.
 HATLES, GEORGE EDWARD, Northampton-park, Canonbury. Aug. 7. Attree Johnson & Ward, Gray's Inn.
 HAYMAN, MAX, Pembroke-gardens, Baywater. Aug. 31. Hyman Isaacs, Lewis & Mills, 7/8, Thavies Inn, Holborn.
 HENSON, ROSE LADY HENRIETTA, Bath. Aug. 23. Bircham & Co., 46, Parliament-st.
 HOLMES, MARY ANN, Darton, Lancs. Aug. 23. Halliwell & Halliwell, Darwen.
 HORNER, CHARLES, Bramley, Leeds, Stone Merchant. Aug. 24. Lucas Whitaker & Co., Leeds.
 HUNT, JAMES, Aston Hill, Oxford. Sept. 23. J. Boschetti Birch, Thame.
 IRELAND, SIR ROBERT MEGAW, C.B., C.M.G., Southsea. Aug. 30. E. J. Bechervaise, Portsmouth.
 KNOWLES, STUART, St. Anne's-on-Sea, Manufacturing Stationer. Sept. 23. Diggle & Oyden, Manchester.
 LANE, JOHN HENRY, Goodmayes, Essex. Sept. 1. Edgar F. Jarvis, 2, Billiter Square-bldgs.
 MARSTON, GEORGE EGERT, Bowral, N.S.W., Australia. Sept. 1. Fillmer & Port, Brighton.
 MOREHOUSE, CLIFTON JAY, Southend-on-Sea, Estate Agent. Aug. 30. F. T. Fisher, Southend-on-Sea.
 MORRIS, MISS CHARLOTTE, Southwark Bridge-rd. Aug. 24. Richardson, Sadlers & Callard, 3, St. James's-st.
 MURD, The Honble. CONSTANCE ELIZABETH, Cadogan-pl., Chelsea. Aug. 15. Lee & Pemberton, 44, Lincoln's Inn-fields.
 NEVILLE, ALICE BLANCH, Egerton-ter. Sept. 7. Elvy, Robb & Welch, 19 Bedford-row.
 NEW, CHARLES WILLIAM, Richmond-rd., Baywater. Aug. 30. Beckingsale & Co., 31, Capthall-av.
 OWTON, EMILY, Southampton. Aug. 30. Hallett & Martin, Southampton.
 PICKERING, SAMUEL, Great Grimby. Aug. 10. H. A. Bell, Gainsborough.
 PIERSON, BEN FISHER, Northorpe, Yorks. Aug. 20. J. A. Stapleton & Son, Dewsbury.
 RAMSAY, LOUISA FRANCES, Bexhill-on-Sea. Sept. 1. Hatchett, Jones, Bisgood, Marshall & Thomas, 48, Mark-ls.

LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY LIMITED.

No. 15, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1853.

Capital Stock ... £400,000
 Debenture Stock ... £331,130

REVERSIONS PURCHASED. ADVANCES MADE THEREON.

Forms of Proposal and full information can be obtained at the Society's Office.
 G. H. MAYNE, Secretary.

RIDGE, SAMUEL HARRISON, Handsworth, Birmingham, Harness Manufacturer. Aug. 31. Bagott & Co., Dudley.
 STEEL, Major EDWARD ANTHONY, D.S.O., R.F.A., Siberia. Aug. 31. Cunliffe, Blake & Mossman, 48, Chancery-ls.
 SQUIRE, WILLIAM HENRY, Kingscott St. Giles, Devon. Aug. 26. Doe & Bates, Great Torrington, Devon.
 THOMPSON, THOMAS, Bournemouth. Aug. 30. J. & W. H. Drutt, Bournemouth.
 TODD, JAMES, Skeldergate, York. Sept. 4. Fred. A. Camidge, 3, Stonegate, York.
 WALFORD, WILMOT FOOTE, Over Norton, Oxford. Sept. 10. Wilkins & Toy, Chipping Norton.
 WESTRAE, SARAH ANN, Ladywood, Birmingham. Sept. 30. Taunton & Whitford, Birmingham.
 WOOD, MARIA, St. Leonards-on-Sea. Aug. 18. S. C. Menner, St. Leonards-on-Sea.

London Gazette.—Friday, July 30.

AGNEW, ANNE ISABELLA, Folkestone, Kent. Sept. 1. Stones, Morris & Stone, 41, Moorgate-st.
 BRAIN, JANE, Brailes, Warwick. Aug. 25. E. B. Hancock, Shipton-on-Stour.
 BRIDGEN, FRANK, Norwich, Licensed Victualler. Aug. 23. Hill & Perks, Norwich.
 CARTER, ALICE MAUD MART, Nottingham. Aug. 30. Walter & Hanson, Nottingham.
 CARTER, CAROLINE, Leicester. Aug. 31. Harris, Watts & Bouskell, Leicester.
 CHAMWRIGHT, FLORENCE AMELIA, Eastbourne. Sept. 11. Collyer-Bristow & Co., Bedford-row.
 CHAMWRIGHT, CHARLES EDWARD HENRY, Eastbourne. Sept. 11. Collyer-Bristow & Co., Bedford-row.
 CUDLOW, JOHN WALTER, Brierley Hill, Staffs., Solicitor. Aug. 28. Clulow & Rudge, Brierley Hill.
 CUDLIP, AMELIA JANE, Church-st., Edgware-rd. Sept. 1. G. E. M. Skues, 31, Essex-st.
 DAVEY, PHILIP JOHN DAWSON, Birkenhead. Aug. 31. J. F. Read & Brown, Liverpool.
 DOOLAN, JAMES, Abertillery, Mon. Aug. 21. W. J. Everett, Pontypool.
 DITSON, HARTLEY, Halifax. Aug. 28. Lewis I. Dey, Halifax.
 ELSON, JAMES, Hatchiff. Sept. 13. W. Archer & Son, 114, Fenchurch-st.
 EVANS, ELLA, Eastington, Staffs. Aug. 26. Geo. F. Baker, Willenhall, Staffs.
 FLOTT, ARTHUR BLANCHARD, Egham-rd., Traveller. Sept. 1. Wilson, Lambert & Midgley, 30, Bedford-row.
 GARE, JOHN REES, Mecklenburgh-sq., Physician. Aug. 27. John J. McIntyre, Holborn.
 GAY, GEORGE, Bristol. Aug. 14. Atchleys, Bristol.
 GIBSON, FRANCIS WILLIAM, Streatham. Sept. 30. Aldhelm Parfitt, 567/9, Fulham-rd.
 GRANT, PETER, Eastcheap, Wine Shipper. Sept. 4. Crosley & Burn, 2, Moorgate Street-bldg.
 HAMILTON, ALICE MART, Quebec, Canada. Sept. 1. Lawrence, Jones & Co., 4, St. Mary Ave.
 HARRISON, REGO, Crews. Aug. 31. Robt. Bygott & Sons, Crews.
 HAWKINS, WALTER, Odham, Hants. Sept. 11. J. Brandbury, 3, Pancras-lane.
 HENDERSON, THOMAS BONNYOT, East Hranham, Salisbury. Aug. 31. Rose, Johnson & Hicks, 9, Suffolk-st.
 HERMAN, SAMUEL WILLIAM, Tilehurst, Reading. Aug. 31. G. E. B. Rogers, Reading.
 HETWOOD, JOHN, Hyde, Chester. Aug. 31. F. Knowles & Son, Hyde.
 HOPKINSON, WILLIAM, Hyde, Chester. Aug. 31. F. Knowles & Son, Hyde.
 HUMBLE, SARAH CAROLINE, Coram-st. Aug. 29. Joseph Gibson, 61, Moorgate-st.
 JAY, JOHN WALTER, Fulham-rd. Sept. 3. Gery & Brooks, 10, Old Cavendish-st., Cavendish-sq.
 LANDOLPH, FRANK ELIS, Brighton. Aug. 31. Edwin Boxall & Kempe, Brighton.
 LINDOY, FANNY, Bournemouth. Sept. 1. J. L. Dickinson & Sons, Weston-super-Mare.
 LOMAX, PENELOPE ANN, Stalybridge, Chester. Aug. 31. Jas. Crowther, Ashton-under-Lyne.
 LODGE, WILLIAM DAVIS, Porthcawl, Glam. Aug. 31. Walter P. David, Bridgend, Glam.
 MELLING, WILLIAM JOHN, Chorlton-on-Medlock, Manchester. Aug. 24. Brooks, Marshall & Moon, Manchester.
 MARSH, THOMAS, St. John's, Deptford. Sept. 3. Marchant, Newington & Tipper, Broadway, Deptford.
 NATHAN, JOHN, Hart-st., Bloomsbury. Aug. 31. Percy Robinson & Co., 15, Great Marlborough-st.
 NORTHCOFT, JOHN, Plymouth. Aug. 31. R. Robinson, Rodd & Son, East Stonehouse, Plymouth.
 PRENSHILL, WILLIAM HENRY, Windsor-rd., Holloway-rd. Aug. 28. F. S. Collinge, Colchester.
 PIM, Reverend WILLIAM FREDERICK, Great Barford Vicarage, Beds. Oct. 1. Carter, Mitchell & Co., Bedford.
 PIM, JAMES, Buckland Saint Mary, Somerset. Sept. 1. G. H. Kite & Sons, Taunton.
 QUELCH, ROBERT JAMES, Billiter-bldgs. Sept. 1. Devonshire, Monkland & Co., Frederick's-pl., Old Jewry.
 QUELCH, ANNIE, Parliament-hill, Hampstead. Sept. 1. Devonshire, Monkland & Co., Frederick's-pl., Old Jewry.
 REYNOLDS, JOHN, Radcliffe-on-Trent, Notts. Aug. 30. Walker & Hanson, Nottingham.
 SANGER, GEORGE CHARLES, Queens-rd., Baywater, Licensed Victualler. Aug. 30. South, Stacey & Castle, 14, Southampton-st., Bloomsbury.
 SMITH, BENJAMIN DAVIDSON, Liverpool. Aug. 31. J. F. Read & Brown, Liverpool.
 STEVENSON, GEORGE, Doncaster, Builder. Sept. 1. Frank Allen, Doncaster.
 TRAINER, PHILIP, Eastbourne. Aug. 31. Fowler & Co., 29, Victoria-st.
 WAT, DAVID, Pinewood Bassett, Southampton. Sept. 1. Bailey, White & Nash, Winchester.
 WEYER, ROBERT, Stevenage, Herts. Sept. 1. C. A. Piper & Smith, 13, Vincent-sq.
 WOOLRICH, JAMES, Greenheys, Manchester. Sept. 11. Lawson, Coppock & Hart, Manchester.

London Gazette.—Tuesday, Aug. 3.

ARMOUR, JEAN BRANK, Liverpool. Aug. 31. Alfred Withers, 51 & 53, Chancery-lane.
 BENSON, WILLIAM DAVID, Carlisle. Aug. 14. Bendle, Gibson & Davidson, Carlisle.
 BODINGTON, MARY REYNOLDS, Paris. Sept. 1. R. H. Behrend & Co., 17, Surrey-st.
 BROWNING, SAMUEL THOMAS BOYD, Crescentwood-rd., Sydenham. Aug. 21. Capron & Co., 7, Savile-pl.
 BUDDEN, ALEXANDER, Bournemouth. Aug. 14. Rawlins, Rawlins & Davy, Bournemouth.

COWLEY, The
 Sept. M.
 COWLEY, FLO
 DUNSTON, L.
 EMMONS, AR
 Faithful
 FRANKFIELD L
 Shaw, S.
 HAVES, WILLI
 Trent.
 HAVES, HACH
 LAW, MARY,
 LETHBRIDGE,
 & WARR
 MILES, EDWIN
 MORRIS, CHAR
 MORRIS,
 NACK, FRANK,
 NAYLOR, WILLI
 Co., Bro
 NEWTON, DAM
 PALMER, GEOR
 PERVIS, Sir R
 ROBERTS, JOH
 Oxford.

Bank

Lon
 BIVIN, HAROL
 High Cou
 BRIMCOMBS, V
 Pet. July
 CAMPBELL, JOH
 Birkenhead
 CROCKFORD, L
 Pet. June
 CROFT, ARTH
 Builder, I
 In Little, Jo
 Companies
 July 9.
 DEBIE, JAMES
 Hachinist.
 Ord. July
 EBRAM, MAUR
 m. High
 FIDWICK, V
 Chemist.
 GRIMSEY, W
 Brighton.
 GILES, WILLI
 Bolton, P
 JOHNSON, F
 Tailor, H
 LIT, PETER
 High Cou
 MALLAN, J
 Court, P
 MILLER, F
 Court, P
 MORTON, JAM
 Greenroo
 July 14.
 NICKOLLS, C
 Contractor
 July 12.
 ROSSINI, EDW
 st. Pet.
 SANDERS, WILL
 castle-upo
 TOMLINSON, J
 Husbands.
 VERBINGER, R
 Pet. July
 WALLACE, VER
 Plymouth.

THE

FIRE,

Non-Mut

THE PO

THE PO

LI

INS

For Fu

COWLEY, The Right Honourable HENRY ARTHUR MORNINGTON, Earl, Chippingham. Sept. 11. Collyer, Bristow & Co., 4, Bedford-row.
COWLEY, FLORENCE, Blackpool. Aug. 20. Harold Worden, Blackpool.
DEWBERRY, LATHIA, Loughborough, Yorks. Sept. 3. Branson & Son, Sheffield.
DEWBERRY, ARABELLA GEORGINA, Parkstone, Dorset. Sept. 11. Marsden, Burnett, Faithfull & Day, 11, Henrietta-st.
FRANKFIELD LOUIS, Buckingham Palace-mansions. Sept. 6. Wordsworth, Russell & Shaw, 39, Lombard-st.
GAIVIN, WILLIAM, South Collingham, Notts. Aug. 24. Colton & Franks, Newark-on-Trent.
HUTCHIN, RACHEL, Leeds. Sept. 1. Harrison & Sons, Leeds.
LAW, MARY, Bolton. Aug. 26. Haughton & Haughton, Bolton.
LATHERIDGE, WILLIAM BERNARD, Musbury, Devon. Aug. 31. Coode, Kingdon, Cotton & Ward, 36, Bedford-row.
MILES EDWIN, Felling, Sussex. Sept. 4. Verrall & Sons, Worthing.
MORRIS, CHARLOTTE SIBTHORPE, JULIA MARIA MORRIS, REBECCA MORRIS, and ANNE MORRIS, Shenley, Bucks. Aug. 28. Fred. Tanqueray, Woburn, Beds.
WACK, FRANK, Mullion, Cornwall. Aug. 23. A. Randle Thomas, Helston, Cornwall.
WELSH, WILLIAM, Princes-gdns., Kensington, Merchant. Sept. 14. Duffield, Bruty & Co., Broad Street-av.
WINTON, DAME ELIZABETH, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Aug. 31. Owsin J. Charlton, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
WINTER, GEORGE OWEN, Cambridge. Sept. 1. A. E. King, Cambridge.
WYNN, SIR ROBERT, Richmond. Aug. 21. Jeffrey C. St. Quintin, 8, Princess-st.
WYNN, JOHN VANCE, Oxford, Doctor of Music. Aug. 28. Linnell & Murphy, Oxford.

RUDD, ERNEST HAROLD, Queen's-rd., Teddington. Sept. 3. White & Leonard, Ludgate-circus.
RCE, ETIENNE, Vienne Isère, France. Sept. 6. Wordsworth, Russell & Shaw, 39, Lombard-st.
SMITH, WILLIAM JAMES SALLIST, Gibraltar, Merchant. Sept. 1. Rottrell & Roche, 24, St. Mary Axe.
TUDOR, EDWARD, Chandle Heath, Chester. Sept. 11. Skelton & Co., Manchester.
VINCOE, JANE CATHERINE, Worthing. Aug. 31. J. W. Parker, Worthing.
WARR, DAVID, Norwich. Sept. 6. L. W. English, Norwich.
WARR, MARY ANN, Norwich. Sept. 6. L. W. English, Norwich.

VALUATIONS FOR INSURANCE.—It is very essential that all Policy Holders should have a detailed valuation of their effects. Property is generally very inadequately insured, and in case of loss insurers suffer accordingly. **DEBENHAM, STORR, & SONS (LIMITED)**, 26, King-street, Covent-garden, W.C. 2, the well-known valuers and chattel auctioneers (established over 100 years), have a staff of Expert Valuers, and will be glad to advise those desiring valuations for any purpose. Jewels, plate, furs, furniture, works of art, bric-à-brac, a speciality. —[ADVT.]

Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, July 16.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BAVIN, HAROLD S., King Henry's-rd., Hampstead. High Court. Pet. May 4. Ord. July 13.
BRIMCOMBE, WILLIAM HENRY, Exeter, Florist. Exeter. Pet. July 12. Ord. July 12.
CAMPBELL, JOHN RICHARD WILLIAM, Egremont, Chester. Birkenhead. Pet. June 24. Ord. July 12.
COCKSHOTT, EDWARD, Waterloo, Lanes. Liverpool. Pet. June 25. Ord. July 13.
CULLEY, ARTHUR THOMAS, Lloyd-sq., Clerkenwell, Builder. High Court. Pet. June 24. Ord. July 13.
DE LYNCE, JOHN BERNARD, Oxford-st., Director of Companies. High Court. Pet. May 26. Ord. July 9.
DEBIE, JAMES EDWARD, South Shields, Woodcutting Machinist. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. July 12. Ord. July 12.
ELMAN, MARGARET KENAL, Old Gloucester-st., Queen's-sq. High Court. Pet. May 31. Ord. July 9.
FIRBANK, WILLIAM, Chorley, Lanes, Printworks Chemist. Preston. Pet. July 14. Ord. July 14.
GAISNER, WALTER, Chichester, Haulage Contractor. Brighton. Pet. July 13. Ord. July 13.
GALEN, WILLIAM LEES, Lowton St. Mary's, Lanes. Bolton. Pet. June 11. Ord. July 14.
JOHNSTON, FREDERICK, Motttingham, Kent, Ladies' Tailor. High Court. Pet. July 12. Ord. July 12.
LAY, PETER ARTHUR WIMS, Eaton-ter., Eaton-sq. High Court. Pet. May 19. Ord. July 14.
MCALLAN, JAMES B., Old Broad-st., Merchant. High Court. Pet. June 14. Ord. July 14.
MILNER, F. M., Sutherland-pl., Bayswater. High Court. Pet. Jan. 8. Ord. July 19.
MORROW, JAMES WILLIAM, Newton Heath, Manchester, Greenroofer. Manchester. Pet. July 14. Ord. July 14.
NICKOLLS, CHARLES JOHN, Cheriton, Kent, Haulage Contractor. Canterbury. Pet. July 12. Ord. July 12.
ROBINS, EDWIN, Evesham, Fruit Merchant. Worcester. Pet. July 12. Ord. July 12.
SANDERS, WILFRED, Blaydon, Durham, Labourer. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. July 14. Ord. July 14.
TOMLINSON, JOHN R., Rochdale, Lanes, Bleacher. Rochdale. Pet. July 2. Ord. July 13.
VERBINGER, PAUL, Sheffield, Toy Maker. Sheffield. Pet. July 14. Ord. July 14.
WALLACE, VERNON SAMUEL, Paignton, Devon, Baker. Plymouth. Pet. July 13. Ord. July 13.

Amended Notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of July 9.
STEWART, CHARLES DARLING, Wyken, Warwick. Coventry. Pet. June 2. Ord. July 5.
 Amended Notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of June 11.
LITHGOW, E. G., Cowley-rd., Brixton, Ladies' Out-fitter. Croydon. Pet. April 24. Ord. June 8.

FIRST MEETINGS.

BAINTON, JOSEPH EDWARD, Crosby, Lanes, Boot Dealer. July 24 at 11. Off. Rec., St. Mary's-chambers, Great Grimsby.
BAVIN, HAROLD S., King Henry's-rd., Hampstead. July 26 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.
BRIMCOMBE, WILLIAM HENRY, Exeter, Florist. July 26 at 11.30. Off. Rec., 9, Bedford-circus, Exeter.
BROWN, ERNEST, Harringay-rd., Hornsey. July 26 at 11. 14, Bedford-row.
CULLEY, ARTHUR THOMAS, Lloyd-sq., Clerkenwell, Builder. July 26 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.
DEBIE, JAMES EDWARD, South Shields, Woodcutting Machinist. July 27 at 11. Off. Rec., 4, Northumberland-st., Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
GRANT, HARRY COOKE, Beaufort, Mon., Stone Mason. July 26 at 10.15. County Court Offices, Town Hall, Freetown.
JOHNSTON, FREDERICK, Motttingham, Kent, Ladies' Tailor. July 26 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.
LAY, PETER ARTHUR WIMS, Eaton-ter., Eaton-sq. July 26 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.
MACALLAN, JAMES B., Old Broad-st., Merchant. July 26 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.
MILNER, F. M., Bayswater. July 26 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.
NICKOLLS, CHARLES JOHN, Cheriton, Kent, Haulage Contractor. July 26 at 11.30. Off. Rec., 68a, Castle-st., Canterbury.
SHIRLEY, WILLIAM, Stockport, Cheshire, Boot Factor. July 26 at 3. Off. Rec., Byron-st., Manchester.

ADJUDICATIONS.

BAILEY, JOHN, Liverpool, Chip Potato Dealer. Liverpool. Pet. June 1. Ord. June 22.
BRIMCOMBE, WILLIAM HENRY, Exeter, Florist. Exeter. Pet. July 12. Ord. July 12.
DE MOILLARD, HENRY HENRY STEINBRACHT, Albemarle-st. High Court. Pet. April 8. Ord. July 12.
DEBIE, JAMES EDWARD, South Shields, Woodcutting Machinist. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. July 12. Ord. July 12.
ETCHES, ARTHUR OSWALD, Scarborough. Scarborough. Pet. May 19. Ord. July 12.

FIRBANK, WILLIAM, Chorley, Lanes, Printworks Chemist. Pet. July 14. Ord. July 14.
GILES, ERNEST BROUGHTON, Rydenham, Schoofmaster. High Court. Pet. May 16. Ord. July 14.
GRAINGER, WALTER, Chichester, Haulage Contractor. Brighton. Pet. July 13. Ord. July 13.
JOHNSTON, FREDERICK, Motttingham, Kent, Ladies' Tailor. High Court. Pet. July 12. Ord. July 12.
MARCOB, HARRY, and JACOB GIBBERSON, Market, Hackney, Boot Manufacturers. High Court. Pet. June 24. Ord. July 14.
MEARES, THOMAS LAWCELOT MERRILL, Dordrecht, Piccadilly, Motor Agent. High Court. Pet. April 14. Ord. July 14.
NORMAN, LEOPOLD ISIDORE NEWMAN, St. James-st. High Court. Pet. May 6. Ord. July 13.
OAKLEY, SAMUEL WISLEY, Gracechurch-st., Shipbroker. High Court. Pet. March 8. Ord. July 14.
RICHTER, JOHN BLANCHARD, Market-st., Jettym-st., Club Proprietor. High Court. Pet. April 14. Ord. July 13.
RODDA, HORACE WYNHAM, Peckham, Engineer. High Court. Pet. June 29. Ord. July 12.
SANDERS, WILFRED, Blaydon, Durham, Labourer. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. July 14. Ord. July 14.
VERBINGER, PAUL, Sheffield, Toy Maker. Sheffield. Pet. July 14. Ord. July 14.
WALLACE, VERNON SAMUEL, Paignton, Devon, Baker. Plymouth. Pet. July 13. Ord. July 13.
WEINSTEIN, ABRAHAM, Margaret-pl., Virginia-rd., Cabinet Maker. High Court. Pet. May 26. Ord. July 12.

Amended Notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of June 29.
HIND, JAMES, Greenwell, Castle Carrock, Cumberland. Carlisle. Pet. May 17. Ord. June 23.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, July 20.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BIARD, AMERIGO, Chester-st., Kensington-rd., Restaurant Manager. High Court. Pet. July 16. Ord. July 16.
BLUESTEIN, PHILLIP, Southsea, Portsmouth. Pet. July 16. Ord. July 16.
CAPPER, ALBERT HEWET, Swindon, Surgical Bootmaker. Swindon. Pet. July 15. Ord. July 15.
HOPKINS & PEARCE, Foleshill, Coventry, Auctioneers. Coventry. Pet. June 28. Ord. July 15.
KIDDLE, WILETT, Northumberland-st., Baker-st., Pianoforte Merchant's Manager. High Court. Pet. July 16. Ord. July 16.
POOLE, ROBERT GORDON, Derby, Cycle Dealer. Derby. Pet. July 14. Ord. July 14.
REDMAN, MYER, Whitechapel-rd. High Court. Pet. June 29. Ord. July 15.

THE LICENSERS AND GENERAL INSURANCE CO., LTD.

CONDUCTING THE INSURANCE POOL for selected risks.

FIRE, BURGLARY, LOSS OF PROFIT, EMPLOYERS', FIDELITY, GLASS, MOTOR, PUBLIC LIABILITY, etc., etc.

Non-Mutual except in respect of **PROFITS** which are distributed annually to the Policy Holders.

THE POOL COMPREHENSIVE FAMILY POLICY at 4/6 per cent. is the most complete Policy ever offered to householders.

THE POOL COMPREHENSIVE SHOPKEEPERS' POLICY Covers all Risks under One Document for One Inclusive Premium.

**LICENSE
INSURANCE.**

SPECIALISTS IN ALL LICENSING MATTERS

Suitable Clauses for Insertion in Leases and Mortgages of Licensed Property settled by Counsel, will be sent on application.

For Further Information write: **VICTORIA EMBANKMENT** (next Temple Station), W.C. 2.

TEASDALE, JOHN HENRY, Durham, Draper. Durham. Pet. July 13. Ord. July 13.

FIRST MEETINGS.

BIAGI, AMERIGO, Chester-st., Kennington-rd., Restaurant Manager. July 30 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

CAMPBELL, JOHN RICHARD WILLIAM, Egremont, Chester. July 29 at 11.30. Off. Rec., 11, Dale-st., Liverpool.

CAPPER, ALBERT HENRY, Swindon, Surgical Bootmaker. July 29 at 11. Off. Rec., 38, Regent-circus, Swindon.

DE LYSLE, JOHN, Berners-st., Oxford-st., Director of Companies. July 29 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

EXHAM, MAURICE KENAR, Old Gloucester-st., Queen's-sq. July 30 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

GRANGER, WALTER, Chichester, Haulage Contractor. July 28 at 2.30. Off. Rec., 124, Marlborough-pl., Brighton.

KIDOLE, WILFRED, Northumberland-st., Baker-st., Piano-forte Manager. July 29 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

MOITON, JAMES WILLIAM, Newton Heath, Manchester, Grocer. July 28 at 3. Off. Rec., Byrom-st., Manchester.

POOLE, ROBERT GORDON, Derby, Cycle Dealer. July 27 at 12. Off. Rec., 4, Castle-pl., Nottingham.

REDMAN, MYER, Whitechapel-rd. July 29 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

SANDBRO, WILFRED, Blaydon, Durham, Boot Dealer. July 28 at 11. Off. Rec., 4, Northumberland-st., Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

VERRINGER, PAUL, Sheffield, Toy Maker. July 27 at 12. Off. Rec., Figtree-lane, Sheffield.

VICKERS, ALFRED, Wellingborough, Northampton, Leather Merchant. July 27 at 12. Off. Rec., The Parade, Northampton.

WALLACE, VERNON SAMUEL, Paignton, Devon, Baker. July 27 at 2.30. Gerston Hotel, Paignton.

ADJUDICATIONS.

ALLAN, RALPH, Chieve Down, Bracknell, Berks. Frome. Pet. June 4. Ord. July 16.

BIAGI, AMERIGO, Chester-st., Kennington-rd., Restaurant Manager. High Court. Pet. July 16. Ord. July 16.

BLUESTEIN, PHILLIP, Southsea, Hants. Portsmouth. Pet. July 16. Ord. July 16.

CAMPBELL, JOHN RICHARD WILLIAM, Egremont, Chester, Hickenhead. Pet. June 24. Ord. July 15.

CAPPER, ALBERT HENRY, Swindon, Surgical Bootmaker. Swindon. Pet. July 15. Ord. July 15.

COCKSHOTT, EDWARD, Waterloo, Lancs., Commission Agent. Pet. June 25. Ord. July 15.

KIDOLE, WILFRED, Northumberland-st., Baker-st., Piano-forte Merchant's Manager. High Court. Pet. July 16. Ord. July 16.

POOLE, ROBERT GORDON, Derby, Cycle Dealer. Derby. Pet. July 14. Ord. July 14.

PRUNIA, A. E., Shepherd's Bush, Ladies' Tailor. High Court. Pet. April 17. Ord. July 15.

SRIBLEY, WILLIAM, Edgeley, Stockport, Boot Factor. Stockport. Pet. July 9. Ord. July 14.

SPEAKMAN, EDWARD MERRAY, Harewood-pl., Hanover-sq. High Court. Pet. May 20. Ord. July 15.

TEASDALE, JOHN HENRY, Durham, Draper. Durham. Pet. July 13. Ord. July 13.

ADJUDICATION ANNULLLED.

FRANCIS, JAMES HAMILTON, Colchester, Cobb Merchant. Colchester. Adjud. March 5, 1919. Annul. July 7, 1920.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, July 23.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BLAKLEY, THOMAS HUTCHINSON, Newburgh, near Wigan. Liverpool. Pet. July 20. Ord. July 21.

CHAPMAN, ALFRED, Maltby, near Rotherham, Nursing Home Proprietor. Sheffield. Pet. July 20. Ord. July 20.

DE KAVANAGH, DENNIS, Wandsworth Common, Director. High Court. Pet. April 14. Ord. July 20.

DOBBS, MATTHEW, Epsom, Surrey, M.D. High Court. Pet. June 29. Ord. July 20.

DUDLEY, SYDNEY G., Kingswinford, Staffs., Stourbridge. Pet. July 2. Ord. July 21.

FRIST, MILICENT GWENDOLINE BLAIR, Hattogate, York. Pet. July 5. Ord. July 20.

HANBY, WALTER, High Spen, Durham, Baker. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. July 17. Ord. July 17.

HOWES, ENOS WILLIAM, Forest Gate, Bookbinder. High Court. Pet. July 19. Ord. July 19.

JACQUOTTE, EDMUND, St. John's Wood, High Court. Pet. April 13. Ord. July 21.

JAGGER, JOHNSON, Halifax, Electrical Engineer. Halifax. Pet. July 21. Ord. July 21.

MANVELL, HORACE, Liverpool-st., General Dealer. High Court. Pet. June 29. Ord. July 21.

MILWARD, J. W., Strand, Printing Contractor. High Court. Pet. June 29. Ord. July 21.

SMYTH, WALTER JOHN, Milton, Cambs., Grocer. Cambridge. Pet. July 20. Ord. July 20.

STICKLAND, JOHN, Lower Teddington-rd., Hampton Wick, Builder. Pet. Mar. 4. Ord. July 19.

THOMAS, BERNARD EDMOND, Norwich, Electrical Engineer. Norwich. Pet. July 7. Ord. July 19.

YOUNG, ANTHONY, Harper-st., High Court. Pet. May 28. Ord. July 9.

FIRST MEETINGS.

BLUESTEIN, PHILLIP, Southsea, Hants, Costumier. Aug. 4 at 12. Off. Rec., High-st., Portsmouth.

COCKSHOTT, EDWARD, Waterloo, Lancs., Commission Agent. July 30 at 11.30. Off. Rec., 11, Dale-st., Liverpool.

DE KAVANAGH, DENNIS, Wandsworth Common, Director. Aug. 5 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

DOBBS, MATTHEW, Epsom, M.D. Aug. 4 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

GERMAT, JAMES HENRY, Burnley, Fried Fish Dealer. Aug. 5 at 10.15. County Court House, Bankhouse-st.

HANBY, WALTER, High Spen, Durham, Baker. July 30 at 11. Off. Rec., 4, Northumberland-st., Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

HOWES, ENOS WILLIAM, Forest Gate, Bookbinder. Aug. 4 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

JACQUOTTE, EDMUND, St. John's Wood, Aug. 5 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

MUSKELL, HORACE, Liverpool-st., General Dealer. Aug. 6 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

MILWARD, J. W., 368, Strand, Printing Contractor. Aug. 6 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

ROBBINS, EDWIN, Evesham, Fruit Merchant. July 30 at 2.30. Off. Rec., Coppenham-st., Worcester.

STICKLAND, JOHN, Hampton Wick. July 30 at 11.30. 132, York-rd.

THOMAS, BERNARD EDMOND, Norwich, Electrical Engineer. July 31 at 1. Off. Rec., 8, Upper King-st.

ADJUDICATIONS.

AVORY, DOUGLAS HENRY, 96, Piccadilly, High Court. Pet. Oct. 22. Ord. July 20.

BAYN, HAROLD STEDMAN, 19, King, Henry-rd., Hampstead, High Court. Pet. May 4. Ord. July 17.

BROWN, ALBERT ERNEST, Harriazay-rd., Hornsey, Edmonton. Pet. May 14. Ord. July 15.

CHAPMAN, ALFRED, Maltby, near Rotherham, Nursing Home Proprietor. Sheffield. Pet. July 20. Ord. July 20.

HANBY, WALTER, High Spen, Durham, Baker. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. July 17. Ord. July 17.

HOWES, ENOS WILLIAM, 108, Wellington-rd., Forest Gate, Bookbinder. High Court. Pet. July 19. Ord. July 19.

JAGGER, JOHNSON, Halifax, Electrical Engineer. Halifax. Pet. July 21. Ord. July 21.

REDMAN, MYER, 60, Whitechapel-rd., High Court. Pet. June 29. Ord. July 19.

SMYTH, WALTER JOHN, Milton, Cambs., Grocer. Cambridge. Pet. July 20. Ord. July 20.

THOMAS, BERNARD EDMOND, Norwich, Electrical Engineer. Norwich. Pet. July 7. Ord. July 21.

ORDER ANNULLING, REVOKING OR RESCINDING ORDER.

MADDOCKS, THOMAS, Treconry, Aberdare, Colliery Manager. Aberdare. Ord. Annul. Rev. or Resc. Adju. Feb. 19, 1909, annul. Rev. or Resc. Feb. 19, 1909, rescind. Annul. Rev. or Resc., June 19, 1920 (annulment and Rescission).

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, July 27.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BUNE, WILLIAM ARTHUR, Queen's-rd., Baywater, Engineer. High Court. Pet. July 22. Ord. July 23.

HALEY, THOMPSON, Heckmondwike, Rag Merchant. Dewsbury. Pet. July 22. Ord. July 22.

MEGGOTT, ALFRED ROWLAND, East Retford, Notts, Electrical Engineer. Lincoln. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.

READ, CURTIS, Westminster, Research Chemist. High Court. Pet. June 8. Ord. July 22.

ROWLANDS, THOMAS, Bala, Ironmonger. Wrexham. Pet. July 20. Ord. July 20.

SCANTON, A., Manchester. Pet. July 9. Ord. July 23.

STRONGTHARM, JOSEPH, Manchester, Poultry Dealer. Manchester. Pet. July 24. Ord. July 24.

WALKER, FRANK, Manchester. Manchester. Pet. June 9. Ord. July 23.

WALSTER, GEORGE EDWIN, Gainsborough, Cab Proprietor. Lincoln. Pet. July 20. Ord. July 20.

WILLIAMS, FANNY, Brookland, Kent, Canterbury. Pet. July 2. Ord. July 24.

FIRST MEETINGS.

BUNE, WILLIAM ARTHUR, Baywater, High-st., Bloomsbury, Engineer. Aug. 5 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

CHAPMAN, ALFRED, Maltby, near Rotherham, Nursing Home Proprietor. Aug. 3 at 12. Off. Rec., Figtree-lane, Sheffield.

GIBBS, WILLIAM LEES, Loston St. Mary's, Lancs. Aug. 4 at 3. Off. Rec., Byrom-st., Manchester.

HALEY, THOMPSON, Heckmondwike, Rag Merchant. Aug. 6 at 11. County Court House, Dewsbury.

JAGGER, JOHNSON, Halifax, Electrical Engineer. Aug. 5 at 10.30. County Court House, Prescott-st., Halifax.

READ, CURTIS, Guildford-st., York-rd., Research Chemist. Aug. 5 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

ROWLANDS, THOMAS, Bala, Merioneth, Ironmonger. Aug. 4 at 12. Crypt-chmbrs., Eastgate-row, Chester.

TEASDALE, JOHN HENRY, Durham, Draper. Aug. 6 at 3. Off. Rec., 3 Manor-pl., Sunderland.

WALSTER, GEORGE EDWIN, Gainsborough. Aug. 5 at 12. Off. Rec., Lincoln.

YOUNG, ANTHONY, Harper-st., Aug. 5 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

ADJUDICATIONS.

BALDWIN, PERCY WILLIAM, Liverpool, and THOMAS HUTCHINSON BLAKLEY, Newburgh, near Wigan, Music Dealers. Liverpool. Pet. June 15. Ord. July 22.

BUNE, WILLIAM, Queen's-rd., Baywater, Engineer. High Court. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.

CURT, RICHARD HARBELL, King-st., Covent Garden. High Court. Pet. June 4. Ord. July 23.

EXHAM, MAURICE KENAR, Old Gloucester-st., Queen's-sq. High Court. Pet. May 31. Ord. July 22.

HALEY, THOMPSON, Heckmondwike, Rag Merchant. Dewsbury. Pet. July 22. Ord. July 22.

JONES, WILLIAM CORNELIUS, Henthcote-st., Gray's Inn-rd., Cinematograph Film Producer. High Court. Pet. April 19. Ord. July 23.

MEGGOTT, ALFRED ROWLAND, East Retford, Electrical Engineer. Lincoln. Pet. July 23. Ord. July 23.

NICKOLLS, CHARLES JOHN, Cheriton, Kent, Haulage Contractor. Canterbury. Pet. July 13. Ord. July 24.

PETIT, WILLIAM, St. Quintin-st., North Kensington, High Court. Pet. June 5. Ord. July 22.

ROWLANDS, THOMAS, Bala, Ironmonger. Wrexham. Pet. July 20. Ord. July 20.

WALSTER, GEORGE EDWIN, Gainsborough, Cab Proprietor. Lincoln. Pet. July 20. Ord. July 20.

ADJUDICATIONS ANNULLLED.

CHAVEN, FRANCIS WORTHINGTON, H.M.S. "Spear," Lieutenant. High Court. Adju. Jan. 27. Annul. July 23.

KINGDON, JOHN LEE, Leicester, Butcher's Salesman. Nottingham. Adju. Oct. 13, 1905. Annul. July 22, 1920.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, July 30.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BAKER, WILLIAM, Dulverton, Somerset, Farmer. High Court. Pet. July 26. Ord. July 26.

BEARDSLEY, JESSIE, Woolton, Poultry Dealer. Liverpool. Pet. July 1. Ord. July 28.

BOLSON, CHARLES, Clephane-rd., Canonbury, Merchant. High Court. Pet. Feb. 6. Ord. July 27.

BRYANT, ERNEST G., Luton, Beds., Hat Manufacturer. Luton. Pet. July 1. Ord. July 27.

BUTTERWORTH, WALTER, Rochdale, General Repairer. Rochdale. Pet. June 22. Ord. July 27.

CLARKE, FRANK, Hanover-sq., African Merchant. High Court. Pet. Apr. 9. Ord. July 27.

HAYES, WILLIAM, Cowcross-st., General Factor. High Court. Pet. July 2. Ord. July 28.

JOHN, JAMES EMILYN, Swansea, Grocer. Swansea. Pet. July 27. Ord. July 27.

OWEN & CO., Heckins Hey, Liverpool, Builders. Liverpool. Pet. July 5. Ord. July 27.

STAMP, ALBERT, Norwich, Carter. Norwich. Pet. July 26. Ord. July 26.

TATTERSFIELD, ARNOLD, Dewsbury Moor, Dewsbury, Rag Merchant. Dewsbury. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.

WALKER, TOM, Stalybridge, Chester, Licensed Victualler. Ashton-under-Lyne. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.

FIRST MEETINGS.

BAKER, WILLIAM, Dulverton, Somerset, Farmer. Aug. 11 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

BALDWIN, PERCY WILLIAM, and THOMAS HUTCHINSON BLAKLEY, Liverpool, Music Dealers. Aug. 19 at 11.30. Off. Rec., 11, Dale-st., Liverpool.

BOLSON, CHARLES, Canonbury, Merchant. Aug. 11 at 11.30. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

CLARKE, FRANK, Hanover-sq., African Merchant. Aug. 11 at 12.30. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

FISHWICK, WILLIAM, Chorley, Printworks Chemist. Aug. 8 at 10.30. Off. Rec., 13, Winkley-st., Preston.

HATER, WILLIAM, Cow Cross-st., General Factor. Aug. 11 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st.

HOPKINS, WILLIAM BEAVIS, Birmingham, and WILLIAM ARTHUR PEARCE, Coventry, Auctioneers. Coventry. Aug. 12. Off. Rec., 8, High-st., Coventry.

MEGGOTT, ALFRED ROWLAND, East Retford, Notts, Electrical Engineer. Aug. 9 at 12. Off. Rec., Lincoln.

TOHLINSON, JOHN R., Rochdale, Bleacher. Aug. 19 at 2.30. Town Hall, Rochdale.

ADJUDICATIONS.

DAVISON, THOMAS HENRY, Unbridge-rd., Harwell, Estate Agent. Brantford. Pet. Apr. 24. Ord. July 27.

FINLAY, CLAUDE BEVERLEY, Richmond, Wandsworth. Pet. Jan. 30. Ord. July 22.

HOPKINS, WILLIAM BEAVIS, Birmingham, and WILLIAM ARTHUR PEARCE, Coventry, Auctioneers. Coventry. Pet. June 28. Ord. July 27.

IRELAND, JOHN, Gowen-st., Fulham, Engineer. High Court. Pet. Mar. 16. Ord. July 28.

JOHN, JAMES EMILYN, Swansea, Grocer. Swansea. Pet. July 27. Ord. July 27.

PHILLIPS, ASHLEY, East Acton, Horse Dealer. Bradford. Pet. May 17. Ord. July 27.

STAMP, ALBERT, Norwich, Carter. Norwich. Pet. July 26. Ord. July 26.

TATTERSFIELD, ARNOLD, Dewsbury Moor, Dewsbury, Rag Merchant. Dewsbury. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.

WALKER, TOM, Stalybridge, Chester, Licensed Victualler. Ashton-under-Lyne. Pet. July 28. Ord. July 28.

The Amended Notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of July 27.

CURT, RICHARD HARBELL, King-st., Covent Garden. High Court. Pet. June 4. Ord. July 23.

ADJUDICATIONS ANNULLLED.

LAMBE, JOHN, Salcombe, Devon, Bootmaker. Plymouth. Adjud. Apr. 12. Annul. July 14.

POULTON, ARTHUR JOSEPH, Falmouth, Portable Theatre Manager. Truro. Adjud. May 7. Annul. July 21.

ADJUDICATION ANNULLLED AND RECEIVING ORDER RESCINDED.

RILEY, JOHN, Liverpool, Fruit Salesman. Liverpool. Rec. Ord. Sept. 20, 1910. Rescind. July 28, 1920. Adjud. Nov. 4, 1910. Annul. July 28, 1920.

O
bent.
ray's
High
trical
23.
Com
ly 24
gton.
ham.
oprie.
Lien-
naul.
stann.
ly 22
High
rpool.
Men.
y 27.
turer.
ntrez.
High
High
anson.
Live-
Pot.
bury,
Ord.
Vic.
Ord.
rmate.
15500
10 at
11 at
chant.
-et.
chemist.
reston.
actor.
ILLIAN
t. 9 at
Nottis.
- Lin-
10 at
anwdh.
Ord.
worth.
ILLIAN
centry.
High
anson.
Brest-
Pot.
y, Bar
uly 23.
d Vic-
Oss.
blished
Garden.
Py-
Theatre
uly 21.
TING
erpool.
s, 1900